

Kinetic equations for systems with long-range interactions: a unified description

Pierre-Henri Chavanis

Laboratoire de Physique Théorique, Université Paul Sabatier, 118 route de Narbonne
31062 Toulouse, France

E-mail: chavanis@irsamc.ups-tlse.fr

Abstract. We complete the existing literature on the kinetic theory of systems with long-range interactions. Starting from the BBGKY hierarchy, or using projection operator technics or a quasilinear theory, a general kinetic equation can be derived when collective effects are neglected. This equation (which is not well-known) applies to possibly spatially *inhomogeneous* systems, which is specific to systems with long-range interactions. Interestingly, the structure of this kinetic equation bears a clear physical meaning in terms of generalized Kubo relations. Furthermore, this equation takes a very similar form for stellar systems and two-dimensional point vortices providing therefore a unified description of the kinetic theory of these systems. If we assume that the system is spatially homogeneous (or axisymmetric for point vortices), this equation can be simplified and reduces to the Landau equation (or its counterpart for point vortices). Our formalism thus offers a simple derivation of Landau-type equations. We also use this general formalism to derive a kinetic equation, written in angle-action variables, describing spatially inhomogeneous systems with long-range interactions. This new derivation solves the shortcomings of our previous derivation [P.H. Chavanis, *Physica A* **377**, 469 (2007)]. Finally, we consider a test particle approach and derive general expressions for the diffusion and friction (or drift) coefficients of a test particle evolving in a bath of field particles. We make contact with the expressions previously obtained in the literature. As an application of the kinetic theory, we argue that the relaxation time is shorter for inhomogeneous (or high-dimensional) systems than for homogeneous (or low-dimensional) systems because there are potentially more resonances. We compare this prediction with existing numerical results for the HMF model and 2D point vortices. For the HMF model, we argue that the relaxation time scales as N for inhomogeneous distributions and as e^N for permanently homogeneous distributions. Phase space structures can reduce the relaxation time by creating some inhomogeneities and resonances. Similar results are expected for 2D point vortices.

1. Introduction

Kinetic theories of systems with long-range interactions are important to understand the dynamical evolution of the system and to study transport properties. They can be used to determine the timescale of “collisional” relaxation towards the Boltzmann distribution, in particular its dependence on the number of particles N . Furthermore, they can tell whether or not the system will truly relax towards statistical equilibrium. Indeed, it is not obvious that complex systems (like systems with long-range interactions) do eventually relax towards Boltzmann equilibrium because the ergodicity assumption which sustains the statistical theory can break down. Different kinetic theories have been developed over the years.

Dilute gases: The first kinetic theory of many-particles system was elaborated by Boltzmann [1] for a dilute gas. In that case, the particles do not interact except during strong collisions. Boltzmann derived his famous equation from which he proved that the entropy increases (H -theorem) and that the system ultimately relaxes towards the Maxwell distribution of statistical equilibrium.

Coulombian plasmas: Landau [2] derived a kinetic equation for a Coulombian plasma by starting from the Boltzmann equation and considering a weak deflection approximation. Indeed, for a Coulombian potential of interaction slowly decreasing with the distance as r^{-1} , weak collisions are the most frequent ones. Each encounter induces a *small* change in the velocity of a particle but the cumulated effect of these encounters leads to a macroscopic process of diffusion in velocity space. The treatment of Landau, which assumes that the particles follow linear trajectories with constant velocity in a first approximation, yields a logarithmic divergence of the diffusion coefficient for both small and large impact parameters but the equation can still be used successfully if appropriate cut-offs are introduced. A natural lower cut-off, which is called the Landau length, corresponds to the impact parameter leading to a deflection at 90° . On the other hand, in a neutral plasma, the potential is screened on a distance corresponding to the Debye length. Phenomenologically, the Debye length provides an upper cut-off. Later on, Lenard [3] and Balescu [4] developed a more precise kinetic theory that could take into account collective effects. This gives rise to the inclusion of the dielectric function $|\epsilon(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v})|^2$ in the denominator of the potential of interaction appearing in the kinetic equation. Physically, this means that the particles are “dressed” by a polarization cloud. The original Landau equation, which ignores collective effects, is recovered from the Lenard-Balescu equation when $|\epsilon(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v})|^2 = 1$. However, with this additional term, it is found that the logarithmic divergence at large scales is now removed and that the Debye length is indeed the natural upper lengthscale to consider. At about the same period, Hubbard [5] developed a test particle approach and derived a Fokker-Planck equation describing the relaxation of a test particle in a bath of field particles. He calculated the diffusion and friction coefficients by evaluating the first and second moments of the velocity deflection and took into account collective effects. It is interesting to note, for historical reasons, that Hubbard [5] was apparently not aware

of the works of Lenard [3] and Balescu [4] at the same period and that he developed his approach independently. However, the three approaches are closely related. Indeed, if we substitute the diffusion and friction coefficients found by Hubbard in the general form of the Fokker-Planck equation and perform minor transformations (a substitution that Hubbard has not explicitly made), one obtains the Lenard-Balescu equation!

Stellar systems: In stellar dynamics, Chandrasekhar [6, 7, 8] developed a kinetic theory of stars in order to determine the timescale of collisional relaxation and the rate of escape of stars from globular clusters. To simplify the kinetic theory, he considered an infinite and homogeneous system. He started from the general Fokker-Planck equation and determined the diffusion coefficient and the friction force (second and first moments of the velocity increments) by considering the mean effect of a succession of two-body encounters[‡]. Since his approach can take into account large deflections, there is no divergence at small impact parameters and the gravitational analogue of the Landau length appears naturally in the treatment of Chandrasekhar. However, his approach leads to a logarithmic divergence at large scales that is more difficult to remove in stellar dynamics than in plasma physics because of the absence of Debye shielding for the gravitational force. In a series of papers, Chandrasekhar & von Neumann [10] developed a completely stochastic formalism of gravitational fluctuations and showed that the fluctuations of the gravitational force are given by the Holtzmark distribution (a particular Lévy law) in which the nearest neighbor plays a prevalent role. From these results, they argued that the logarithmic divergence has to be cut-off at the interparticle distance. However, since the interparticle distance is smaller than the Debye length, the same arguments should also apply in plasma physics, which is not the case. Therefore, the conclusions of Chandrasekhar & von Neumann are usually taken with circumspection. In particular, Cohen *et al.* [11] argue that the logarithmic divergence should be cut-off at the physical size R of the cluster (or at the Jeans length) since the Jeans length is the presumable analogue of the Debye length in the present context. These kinetic theories lead to a relaxation time of the form $t_R \sim (N/\ln N)t_D$ where t_D is the dynamical time. Chandrasekhar [12] also developed a Brownian theory of stellar dynamics and showed that, on a qualitative point of view, the results of kinetic theory can be understood very simply in that framework. In particular, he showed that the *dynamical friction* is necessary to reproduce the Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution at equilibrium and that the coefficients of diffusion and friction are related to each other by an Einstein relation. This relation is confirmed by his more precise kinetic theory. It is important to emphasize, however, that Chandrasekhar did not derive the kinetic equation for the evolution of the system *as a whole*. Indeed, he considered the Brownian motion of a test star in a *fixed* distribution of field stars (bath) and derived the corresponding Fokker-Planck equation[§]. This equation has been used

[‡] Later, Rosenbluth *et al.* [9] proposed a simplified derivation of the coefficients of diffusion and friction for stellar systems and for plasmas (without collective effects).

[§] Indeed, Chandrasekhar [7, 8] models the evolution of globular clusters by the Kramers equation which has a fixed temperature (canonical description) while a more relevant kinetic equation would be

to study the evaporation of stars from globular clusters [8, 13, 14, 15, 16]. King [17] noted that, if we were to describe the dynamical evolution of the cluster as a whole, the distribution of the field particles must evolve in time in a self-consistent manner so that the kinetic equation must be an integrodifferential equation. The kinetic equation obtained by King is equivalent to the Landau equation^{||}. It is interesting to note, for historical reasons, that none of the previous authors seemed to be aware of the work of Landau [2] at that time[¶]. There is, however, an important difference between stellar dynamics and plasma physics. Neutral plasmas are usually spatially homogeneous due to Debye shielding. By contrast, stellar systems are spatially inhomogeneous. The above-mentioned kinetic theories developed for an infinite homogeneous system can be applied to an inhomogeneous system only if we make a *local approximation*. In that case, the collision term is calculated as if the system were spatially homogeneous or as if the collisions could be treated as local. Then, the effect of spatial inhomogeneity is only retained in the advective (Vlasov) term which describes the evolution of the system due to mean-field effects⁺. This leads to the Vlasov-Landau-Poisson system which is the standard kinetic equation of stellar dynamics. To our knowledge, this equation has been first written and studied by Hénon [23]. Hénon also exploited the timescale separation between the dynamical time t_D and the relaxation time $t_R \gg t_D$ to derive a simplified kinetic equation for $f(\epsilon, t)$, where $\epsilon = v^2/2 + \Phi(\mathbf{r}, t)$ is the individual energy, called the orbit-averaged-Fokker-Planck equation. In this approach, the distribution function $f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}, t)$, averaged over a short timescale, is a steady state of the Vlasov equation of the form $f(\epsilon, t)$ which slowly evolves in time (on a long timescale) due to the development of “collisions” (i.e. correlations due to finite N effects or graininess). Cohn [24] numerically solved this equation to describe the collisional evolution of star clusters and investigate the gravothermal catastrophe that was predicted by Antonov [25] and Lynden-Bell & Wood [26] on the basis of statistical mechanics. The local approximation, which is a crucial step in the kinetic theory, is supported by the stochastic approach of Chandrasekhar & von Neumann [10] showing the preponderance of the nearest neighbor. However, this remains a simplifying assumption which is not easily controllable. In particular, as we have already indicated, the local approximation leads to a logarithmic divergence at large scales that is difficult to remove. This divergence would not have occurred if full account of spatial inhomogeneity had been given since the start. On the other hand, the Fokker-Planck equation is based on a Markov assumption and this

the Landau equation which conserves the energy (microcanonical description).

^{||} This is not obvious on the form given by King, that is deduced from the work of Rosenbluth *et al.* [9]. However, the connection with the Landau equation can be made easily by using simple integrations by parts; see Ref. [18] for a recent discussion of that issue.

[¶] To our knowledge, the first explicit reference to the Landau equation appeared much later in the paper of Kandrup [19]. There is also a strange comment related to the work of Landau in the paper of Cohen *et al.* [11].

⁺ The nowadays called “Vlasov equation” was introduced by Jeans [20] in stellar dynamics and by Vlasov [21] in plasma physics. See Hénon [22] for interesting comments about the name that one should give to that equation.

assumption is not clearly justified for stellar systems. Memory effects can be important for self-gravitating systems because, as shown by Chandrasekhar [27], the temporal correlation function of the force decreases algebraically as $1/t$ instead of exponentially. This slow decay results in a logarithmic divergence of the diffusion coefficient for large times when one considers the Kubo formula. As shown by Lee [28], the spatial and temporal logarithmic divergences are equivalent, i.e. they are two manifestations of the same phenomenon. The effect of spatial and temporal delocalization was investigated by Gilbert [29], Severne & Haggerty [30], and Kandrup [19]. In particular, Kandrup derived a generalized Landau equation by using projection operator technics. Recently, Chavanis [31, 32] obtained this equation in a simpler manner from the BBGKY hierarchy or from a quasilinear theory as an expansion in $1/N$ in a proper thermodynamic limit. This generalized kinetic equation is interesting because it can take into account effects of spatial inhomogeneity and memory which are neglected in the previous approaches. It clearly shows which approximations are needed in order to recover the Landau equation. However, the generalized Landau equation remains extremely complicated for practical applications.

Two-dimensional point vortices and non-neutral plasmas: It is well-known that a non-neutral plasma under a strong magnetic field is isomorphic to a system of point vortices in 2D hydrodynamics [33]. These systems are described by Hamiltonian equations in which the coordinates x and y of the particles are canonically conjugate [34]. The particles (charges or vortices) interact through a long-range potential that is played by the electric potential in a plasma or by the stream function in 2D hydrodynamics. The statistical mechanics of 2D point vortices was pioneered by Onsager [35] and further developed by Montgomery & Joyce [33] and Lundgren & Pointin [36] in a mean field approximation (recently, Eyink & Sreenivasan [37] have discovered that Onsager had first performed this mean field theory in unpublished notes). Kinetic theories of these systems were developed much later. Dubin & O'Neil [38] derived a kinetic equation for a 2D guiding center plasma by starting from the Klimontovich equation and using a quasilinear theory. Independently, Chavanis [39] derived a kinetic equation for 2D point vortices by using projection operator technics and, more recently [40], by using a BBGKY-like hierarchy or a quasilinear theory. The kinetic equation derived by Dubin & O'Neil takes into account collective effects and can be considered as the counterpart of the Lenard-Balescu equation in plasma physics. The kinetic equation derived by Chavanis ignores collective effects and can be considered as the counterpart of the Landau equation in plasma physics and stellar dynamics. However, the approach of Chavanis is formulated for an arbitrary distribution of point vortices while the approach of Dubin & O'Neil is restricted to axisymmetric distributions. These kinetic equations are valid at the order $O(1/N)$ in a proper thermodynamic limit, so that they describe the evolution of the system on a timescale of order Nt_D . For $N \rightarrow +\infty$, we get the 2D Euler equation which describes collisionless systems. At the order $1/N$, the collision operator describes the development of correlations between point vortices. However, when we consider axisymmetric distributions, it is found that the collision operator

cancels out when the profile of angular velocity becomes monotonic. In that case, the evolution stops even if the system has not reached statistical equilibrium [39, 41, 40]. This implies that the relaxation time of the system as a whole is larger than Nt_D , where t_D is the dynamical time, so that higher order correlations (three-body, four-body...) must be advocated [39]. It is also possible that the point vortex gas does not reach the Boltzmann distribution predicted by statistical mechanics. Indeed, the dynamics may be non-ergodic as discussed by Khanin [42]. On the other hand, using an analogy with stellar dynamics and Brownian theory, Chavanis [43, 39, 40] derived a Fokker-Planck equation describing the relaxation of a test vortex in a bath of field vortices at statistical equilibrium. The relaxation is due to a competition between a diffusion term and a drift term. The *systematic drift* [43], which is the counterpart of the dynamical friction [12] in stellar dynamics, is necessary to obtain the Boltzmann distribution at statistical equilibrium. The diffusion coefficient and the drift term are related to each other by an appropriate Einstein relation and *they are inversely proportional to the local shear created by the field vortices*. The properties of this Fokker-Planck equation have been studied by Chavanis & Lemou [41]. On the other hand, Chavanis & Sire [44] have studied the statistics of the velocity fluctuations arising from a random distribution of point vortices by using an approach similar to the one developed by Chandrasekhar & von Neumann [10] for the gravitational force, but leading to different results due to the lower dimension of space. The numerous analogies between the statistical mechanics and the kinetic theories of stellar systems and 2D vortices are discussed by Chavanis [45]*. Other interesting kinetic theories of 2D point vortices have been developed by Nazarenko & Zakharov [46], Marmanis [47], Sire & Chavanis [48] and Newton & Mezic [49].

HMF model: in the past, the kinetic theories of systems with long-range interactions have been essentially developed for plasmas, stellar systems and 2D vortices. Recently, there was a renewed interest from a part of the community of statistical mechanics for systems with long-range interactions. In that context, a simple model of systems with long-range interactions, the so-called Hamiltonian Mean Field (HMF) model, has been extensively studied [50]. It consists of N particles moving on a ring and interacting via a cosine potential. It can be viewed as a one dimensional periodic system where the potential of interaction is truncated to one Fourier mode. This is certainly the simplest system with long-range interactions that we can imagine. However, it remains highly non trivial and, interestingly, it exhibits many features common to other systems with long-range interactions such as self-gravitating systems. The kinetic theory of the spatially homogeneous phase of the HMF model has been developed by Bouchet [51], Bouchet & Dauxois [52] and Chavanis *et al.* [53] (Inagaki [54] first developed a kinetic theory of the HMF model but he arrived at incorrect conclusions). They considered an

* As reported by Eyink & Sreenivasan [37], Onsager first pointed out analogies between stellar systems and 2D vortices. In a Letter to Lin he wrote: “At *negative* temperatures, the appropriate statistical methods have analogues not in the theory of electrolytes, but in the statistics of stars...”. However, Onsager did not develop this matter further.

expansion of the equations of the dynamics in powers of $1/N$ in a proper thermodynamic limit. For $N \rightarrow +\infty$, this leads to the Vlasov equation. At the order $O(1/N)$, this leads to the one dimensional version of the Lenard-Balescu equation. However, the Lenard-Balescu collision operator is known to vanish in one dimension [55, 56]. This implies that the relaxation time is larger than Nt_D , where t_D is the dynamical time. This result of kinetic theory is in agreement with direct numerical simulations that lead to $t_R \sim N^{1.7}t_D$ [57] or even $t_R \sim e^N t_D$ [58] depending on the initial conditions. These authors also considered the relaxation of a test particle in a bath of field particles. It is described by a Fokker-Planck equation, involving a diffusion and a friction, which is the one dimensional version of the Fokker-Planck equation derived by Hubbard [5] in plasma physics. It can also be deduced from the Lenard-Balescu equation by making a bath approximation $\sharp$. Bouchet & Dauxois [52] used this Fokker-Planck equation to show that the temporal correlation function of the velocity decreases algebraically with time leading to (weak or strong) anomalous diffusion (related results were previously obtained by Marksteiner *et al.* [59] in the very different context of optical lattices). The theoretical results of Bouchet & Dauxois [52] are in very good agreement with direct numerical simulations in the situations considered [60]. Chavanis & Lemou [61], developing the theory of Potapenko *et al.* [62], used the Fokker-Planck equation to study the relaxation of the distribution function tail and show that it has a front structure moving very slowly (logarithmically) with time. Some features of the kinetic theory of the spatially *inhomogeneous* phase of the HMF model have been considered in Ref. [63].

A first objective of the present paper is to develop a unified kinetic theory of systems with long-range interactions. In particular, we show that, when collective effects are neglected, a generalized kinetic equation can be given for stellar systems [see Eq. (2)], for the HMF model [see Eq. (2)] and for 2D point vortices [see Eq. (52)]. This equation, which is not well-known, applies to spatially inhomogeneous systems (or non axisymmetric distributions of point vortices) and bears a clear physical meaning in terms of generalized Kubo relations. Furthermore, it avoids the use of Fourier-Laplace transforms and remains in physical space. For homogeneous distributions (or for axisymmetric distributions in the case of point vortices), it reduces to the Landau equation (or to its counterpart in 2D hydrodynamics). Therefore, our paper offers a new derivation of Landau-type equations from a simple formalism and develops the calculations in detail. A drawback of our approach is to neglect collective effects that would lead to Lenard-Balescu-type equations in the homogeneous case. A second objective of the paper is to use this general formalism to derive a kinetic equation, written in angle-action variables, describing spatially inhomogeneous systems with

$\sharp$ The Lenard-Balescu equation and the Fokker-Planck equation keep the same form in any dimension of space, and for any potential of interaction $u(|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|)$, differing only in a multiplicative constant $(2\pi)^d$ [18]. Therefore, they can be directly applied to the HMF model, and more generally to any system with long-range interactions. However, the explicit expressions of the diffusion coefficient and friction force depend on the dimension of space. Some useful expressions in $d = 3, 2, 1$ dimensions are given in [18].

long-range interactions. This new derivation solves the shortcomings of our previous derivation [64]. We also derive general expressions for the diffusion and friction (or drift) coefficients of a test particle evolving in a bath of field particles and make contact with the expressions previously obtained in the literature. Finally, we use this kinetic theory to argue that the relaxation time is shorter for inhomogeneous (or high-dimensional) systems than for homogeneous (or low-dimensional) systems because there are potentially more resonances, and we compare this prediction with existing numerical results. For the HMF model, we argue that the relaxation time scales as N for inhomogeneous distributions and as e^N for permanently homogeneous distributions. Phase space structures can reduce the relaxation time by creating some inhomogeneities and resonances. Similar results are expected for 2D point vortices.

2. Stellar systems and HMF model

2.1. The evolution of the system as a whole: the kinetic equation

Let us consider an isolated system of particles with long-range interactions described by the Hamiltonian equations

$$\begin{aligned} m \frac{d\mathbf{r}_i}{dt} &= \frac{\partial H}{\partial \mathbf{v}_i}, & m \frac{d\mathbf{v}_i}{dt} &= -\frac{\partial H}{\partial \mathbf{r}_i}, \\ H &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N m v_i^2 + m^2 \sum_{i<j} u(\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $u(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}')$ is a binary potential of interaction depending only on the absolute distance $|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|$ between the particles. We consider the proper thermodynamic limit $N \rightarrow +\infty$ in such a way that the normalized energy $\epsilon = E/(u_* N^2 m^2)$ and the normalized temperature $\eta = \beta N m^2 u_*$ are of order unity, where u_* represents the typical value of the potential of interaction [65]. By a suitable normalization of the parameters, we can consider $N \rightarrow +\infty$ with $V \sim E/N \sim \beta \sim m \sim 1$ and $u_* \sim 1/N$. This is the usual Kac prescription which amounts to putting $\frac{1}{N}$ in front of the interaction energy (for rigorous mathematical results see [66, 67]). We can also consider $N \rightarrow +\infty$ with $V \sim E \sim \beta/N \sim u_* \sim 1$ and $m \sim 1/N$. When collective effects are ignored, the kinetic equation describing the evolution of the distribution function $f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}, t)$ at the order $O(1/N)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{r}} + \frac{N-1}{N} \langle \mathbf{F} \rangle \cdot \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{v}} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial v^\mu} \int_0^t d\tau \int d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{v}_1 F^\mu(1 \rightarrow 0) G(t, t - \tau) \\ &\times \left[\mathcal{F}^\nu(1 \rightarrow 0) \frac{\partial}{\partial v^\nu} + \mathcal{F}^\nu(0 \rightarrow 1) \frac{\partial}{\partial v_1^\nu} \right] f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}, t - \tau) \frac{f}{m}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{v}_1, t - \tau), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{F}(1 \rightarrow 0)$ is the force (by unit of mass) created by particle 1 (with position $\mathbf{r}_1$ and velocity $\mathbf{v}_1$) on particle 0 (with position $\mathbf{r}$ and velocity $\mathbf{v}$) and $\mathcal{F}^\mu(1 \rightarrow 0) = \mathbf{F}(1 \rightarrow 0) - \langle \mathbf{F} \rangle / N$ is the fluctuating force with respect to the average force $\langle \mathbf{F} \rangle(\mathbf{r}, t) = -\nabla \Phi(\mathbf{r}, t)$ experienced by particle 0. On the other hand, $G(t, t - \tau)$ is the Greenian constructed with the mean flow in phase space. The kinetic equation (2) is not well-known and this

is why we try to publicize it in this paper. It has been obtained by Kandrup [19] from a projection operator formalism and by Chavanis [31, 32] from the BBGKY hierarchy and from a quasilinear theory. The BBGKY hierarchy is closed by neglecting the three body correlation function which is of order $O(1/N^2)$. The structure of this equation bears a clear physical meaning. It involves a diffusion term and a friction term. The coefficients of diffusion and friction are given by generalized Kubo formulae, i.e. the time integral of the temporal correlations of the fluctuating force. The collision term $C_N[f]$ (r.h.s.) is valid at the order $1/N$ so that it describes the “collisional” evolution of the system (ignoring collective effects) on a timescale of order Nt_D . For $N \rightarrow +\infty$, we obtain the Vlasov equation in which collisions (more properly correlations) are neglected (for rigorous mathematical results see [68, 69, 70]). When coupled to an attractive long-range potential (e.g., the gravitational potential), the Vlasov equation can generate a process of violent collisionless relaxation on a few dynamical times t_D . A statistical theory of violent relaxation has been developed by Lynden-Bell [71] for stellar systems, but its domain of applicability is more general. Equation (2) is a non-Markovian integro-differential equation. It can describe the evolution of stellar systems, or the evolution of the HMF model, taking into account delocalizations in space and time (i.e. spatial inhomogeneity and memory effects). If we make a Markovian approximation and extend the time integral to $+\infty$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{r}} + \frac{N-1}{N} \langle \mathbf{F} \rangle \cdot \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{v}} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial v^\mu} \int_0^{+\infty} d\tau \int d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{v}_1 F^\mu(1 \rightarrow 0) \\ &\times G(t, t-\tau) \left[\mathcal{F}^\nu(1 \rightarrow 0) \frac{\partial}{\partial v^\nu} + \mathcal{F}^\nu(0 \rightarrow 1) \frac{\partial}{\partial v_1^\nu} \right] f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}, t) \frac{f}{m}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{v}_1, t). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The Markov approximation is not rigorously justified for self-gravitating systems because the force auto-correlation function decreases algebraically like $1/t$ [27], instead of exponentially. The Markov approximation is also expected to be incorrect for the HMF model and other systems with long-range interactions if we are close to the critical point. However, except for these situations, the Markovian approximation should be justified in the $N \rightarrow +\infty$ limit because the timescale $\sim Nt_D$ on which $f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}, t)$ changes is long compared to the timescale τ_{corr} for which the integrand in Eq. (2) has significant support. The Markovian equation (3) applies to possibly spatially inhomogeneous distribution functions, which is a specificity of systems with long-range interactions. Now, for spatially homogeneous distribution functions $f(\mathbf{v}, t)$, the kinetic equation reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial v^\mu} \int_0^{+\infty} d\tau \int d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{v}_1 F^\mu(1 \rightarrow 0) G(t, t-\tau) \\ &\times \left[F^\nu(1 \rightarrow 0) \frac{\partial}{\partial v^\nu} + F^\nu(0 \rightarrow 1) \frac{\partial}{\partial v_1^\nu} \right] f(\mathbf{v}, t) \frac{f}{m}(\mathbf{v}_1, t). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

This is valid as long as the homogeneous distribution is Vlasov stable. In fact, the distribution $f(\mathbf{v}, t)$ will change due to the development of correlations and graininess effects (i.e. the r.h.s. of the kinetic equation) and, at some point of the evolution, the distribution may become Vlasov unstable. In that case, a dynamical phase transition

from a homogenous state to an inhomogeneous state can take place. Such a transition has been illustrated numerically for the HMF model by Campa *et al.* [72]. Using the symmetry of the force $\mathbf{F}(0 \rightarrow 1) = -\mathbf{F}(1 \rightarrow 0)$, and the equations of the unperturbed trajectory

$$\mathbf{v}(t - \tau) = \mathbf{v}(t) = \mathbf{v}, \quad \mathbf{r}(t - \tau) = \mathbf{r}(t) - \mathbf{v}(t)\tau = \mathbf{r} - \mathbf{v}\tau, \quad (5)$$

corresponding to $\langle \mathbf{F} \rangle = \mathbf{0}$, the kinetic equation can be written

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial v^\mu} \int d\mathbf{v}_1 K^{\mu\nu} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial v^\nu} - \frac{\partial}{\partial v_1^\nu} \right) f(\mathbf{v}, t) \frac{f}{m}(\mathbf{v}_1, t), \quad (6)$$

with

$$K^{\mu\nu} = \int_0^{+\infty} d\tau \int d\mathbf{r}_1 F^\mu(1 \rightarrow 0, t) F^\nu(1 \rightarrow 0, t - \tau). \quad (7)$$

Now, the force (by unit of mass) created by particle 1 on particle 0 is given by

$$\mathbf{F}(1 \rightarrow 0) = -m \frac{\partial u}{\partial \mathbf{r}}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_1). \quad (8)$$

Introducing the Fourier transform of the potential

$$u(\mathbf{x}) = \int e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}} \hat{u}(\mathbf{k}) d\mathbf{k}, \quad \hat{u}(\mathbf{k}) = \int e^{-i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}} u(\mathbf{x}) \frac{d\mathbf{x}}{(2\pi)^d}, \quad (9)$$

we get

$$\mathbf{F}(1 \rightarrow 0, s) = -im \int \mathbf{k} e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot (\mathbf{r}(s) - \mathbf{r}_1(s))} \hat{u}(\mathbf{k}) d\mathbf{k}. \quad (10)$$

Using the equations of motion (5), and introducing $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_1$ and $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_1$, we obtain

$$\mathbf{F}(1 \rightarrow 0, t - \tau) = -im \int \mathbf{k} e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{w}\tau)} \hat{u}(\mathbf{k}) d\mathbf{k}. \quad (11)$$

Therefore

$$K^{\mu\nu} = -m^2 \int_0^{+\infty} d\tau \int d\mathbf{x} \int d\mathbf{k} \int d\mathbf{k}' k^\mu k'^\nu e^{i(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}') \cdot \mathbf{x}} e^{-i\mathbf{k}' \cdot \mathbf{w}\tau} \hat{u}(\mathbf{k}) \hat{u}(\mathbf{k}'). \quad (12)$$

Using the identity

$$\delta(\mathbf{x}) = \int e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}} \frac{d\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^d}, \quad (13)$$

and integrating on $\mathbf{x}$, then on $\mathbf{k}'$, we find that

$$K^{\mu\nu} = (2\pi)^d m^2 \int_0^{+\infty} d\tau \int d\mathbf{k} k^\mu k^\nu e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{w}\tau} \hat{u}(\mathbf{k}) \hat{u}(-\mathbf{k}). \quad (14)$$

Since $u(\mathbf{x})$ is real, we have $\hat{u}(-\mathbf{k}) = \hat{u}(\mathbf{k})^*$. Furthermore, since $u(-\mathbf{x}) = u(\mathbf{x})$, we have $\hat{u}(\mathbf{k})^* = \hat{u}(\mathbf{k})$. Therefore, $\hat{u}(\mathbf{k})$ is real and $\hat{u}(-\mathbf{k}) = \hat{u}(\mathbf{k})$. Therefore,

$$K^{\mu\nu} = (2\pi)^d m^2 \int_0^{+\infty} d\tau \int d\mathbf{k} k^\mu k^\nu e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{w}\tau} \hat{u}(\mathbf{k})^2. \quad (15)$$

Making the transformation $\tau \rightarrow -\tau$, then $\mathbf{k} \rightarrow -\mathbf{k}$, and adding the resulting expression to Eq. (15), we get

$$K^{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} (2\pi)^d m^2 \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\tau \int d\mathbf{k} k^\mu k^\nu e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{w}\tau} \hat{u}(\mathbf{k})^2. \quad (16)$$

Using the identity (13), we finally obtain

$$K^{\mu\nu} = \pi(2\pi)^d m^2 \int d\mathbf{k} k^\mu k^\nu \delta(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{w}) \hat{u}(\mathbf{k})^2. \quad (17)$$

Therefore, the kinetic equation takes the form

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} = \pi(2\pi)^d m \frac{\partial}{\partial v^\mu} \int k^\mu k^\nu \delta(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{w}) \hat{u}(\mathbf{k})^2 \left(f_1 \frac{\partial f}{\partial v^\nu} - f \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial v_1^\nu} \right) d\mathbf{v}_1 d\mathbf{k}, \quad (18)$$

where we have noted $f = f(\mathbf{v}, t)$ and $f_1 = f(\mathbf{v}_1, t)$. The calculation of $K^{\mu\nu}$ is detailed in Appendix A. Finally, the kinetic equation can be written

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} = K_d \frac{\partial}{\partial v^\mu} \int \frac{w^2 \delta^{\mu\nu} - w^\mu w^\nu}{w^3} \left(f_1 \frac{\partial f}{\partial v^\nu} - f \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial v_1^\nu} \right) d\mathbf{v}_1, \quad (19)$$

with

$$K_3 = 8\pi^5 m \int_0^{+\infty} k^3 \hat{u}(k)^2 dk, \quad K_2 = 8\pi^3 m \int_0^{+\infty} k^2 \hat{u}(k)^2 dk. \quad (20)$$

This is the original form given by Landau [2] for the Coulombian interaction (in $d = 3$). The Landau equation is derived here in a very different manner. This equation also applies to stellar systems if we make a *local approximation*. In that case, the distribution functions $f = f(\mathbf{v}, t)$ and $f_1 = f(\mathbf{v}_1, t)$ must be replaced by $f = f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}, t)$ and $f_1 = f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}_1, t)$ and we must restore the advective (Vlasov) term in the l.h.s. where the gravitational field is determined by the Poisson equation. Using $(2\pi)^3 \hat{u}(\mathbf{k}) = -4\pi G/k^2$, this yields the Vlasov-Landau-Poisson equation

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{r}} - \nabla \Phi \cdot \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{v}} = K \frac{\partial}{\partial v^\mu} \int \frac{w^2 \delta^{\mu\nu} - w^\mu w^\nu}{w^3} \left(f_1 \frac{\partial f}{\partial v^\nu} - f \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial v_1^\nu} \right) d\mathbf{v}_1, \quad (21)$$

$$\Delta \Phi = 4\pi G \int f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}, t) d\mathbf{v}, \quad (22)$$

where $K = 2\pi m G^2 \ln \Lambda$ and $\ln \Lambda = \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{dk}{k}$ is the usual Coulomb logarithm that has to be regularized with appropriate cut-offs. It scales like $\ln \Lambda \sim \ln N$ (see, e.g., [31]).

The kinetic equation generalizing the Landau Eq. (20) by taking into account collective effects is the Lenard-Balescu equation [3, 4]:

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} = \pi(2\pi)^d m \frac{\partial}{\partial v^\mu} \int k^\mu k^\nu \delta(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{w}) \frac{\hat{u}(\mathbf{k})^2}{|\epsilon(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v})|^2} \left(f_1 \frac{\partial f}{\partial v^\nu} - f \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial v_1^\nu} \right) d\mathbf{v}_1 d\mathbf{k}, \quad (23)$$

where $\epsilon(\mathbf{k}, \omega)$ is the dielectric function

$$\epsilon(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = 1 + (2\pi)^d \hat{u}(\mathbf{k}) \int \frac{\mathbf{k} \cdot \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{v}}}{\omega - \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v}} d\mathbf{v}. \quad (24)$$

The Landau equation is recovered by taking $|\epsilon(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v})|^2 = 1$. In plasma physics, it has been shown that collective effects regularize the logarithmic divergence at large scales that appears in the Landau equation. The Landau and the Lenard-Balescu equations conserve mass $M = \int f d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{v}$ and energy (reducing to the kinetic energy $E = \int f \frac{v^2}{2} d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{v}$ for a spatially homogeneous system) and monotonically increase the Boltzmann entropy

$S = - \int \frac{f}{m} \ln \frac{f}{m} d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{v}$ (H -theorem). The collisional evolution is due to a condition of resonance between the orbits of the particles. For spatially homogeneous systems, the condition of resonance encapsulated in the δ -function corresponds to $\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1$ with $\mathbf{v} \neq \mathbf{v}_1$. For $d > 1$, the only stationary solution of the Landau and Lenard-Balescu equations is the Maxwell distribution $f = Ae^{-\beta m \frac{v^2}{2}}$ and these equations relax towards the Maxwell distribution for $t \rightarrow +\infty$. Since the collision term is valid at the order $O(1/N)$, the relaxation time scales like

$$t_R \sim Nt_D, \quad (d > 1). \quad (25)$$

This scaling, predicted in [73], has been confirmed for a two-dimensional plasma in [74, 18]. For the Newtonian potential in $d = 3$ there is a well-known logarithmic divergence at large-scales in the Landau equation (21). This divergence is due to the assumption of spatial homogeneity and to the linear trajectory approximation, and is not present in the generalized Landau equation (2). When this divergence is properly regularized, the relaxation time is found to be $t_R \sim (N/\ln N)t_D$ (see, e.g., [31]). This is the Chandrasekhar relaxation time. For one-dimensional systems, like the HMF model, the kinetic equation (23) reduces to

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} = 2\pi^2 m \frac{\partial}{\partial v} \int dv_1 dk |k| \frac{\hat{u}(k)^2}{|\epsilon(k, kv)|^2} \delta(v - v_1) \left(f_1 \frac{\partial f}{\partial v} - f \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial v_1} \right) = 0, \quad (26)$$

where we have used the identity $\delta(\lambda x) = \frac{1}{|\lambda|} \delta(x)$. Therefore, the collision term $C_N[f]$ vanishes at the order $1/N$ because there is no resonance. The kinetic equation reduces to $\partial f / \partial t = 0$ so that the distribution function does not evolve at all on a timescale $\sim Nt_D$. This result is known for a long time in plasma physics and was discovered by Eldridge & Feix [55] (see also [56]) for a one-dimensional plasma: “*To first order in the small parameter $g = (nD)^{-1}$, the detailed balance between drag and diffusion is valid not only at thermal equilibrium but for any stable function $f(v)$. So the Maxwellization is, at least, a second-order effect in g and consequently a very slow process*”. This result has been rediscovered recently for the HMF model by Bouchet & Dauxois [52] and Chavanis *et al.* [53]. This implies that, for one-dimensional homogeneous systems, the relaxation time towards statistical equilibrium is larger than Nt_D . We therefore expect that

$$t_R > Nt_D, \quad (d = 1). \quad (27)$$

For the HMF model, it has been found numerically that $t_R \sim N^{1.7}t_D$ [57] or $t_R \sim e^N t_D$ [58], depending on the type of initial conditions. For 1D inhomogeneous distributions, the relaxation time can be reduced and approach the natural scaling Nt_D associated to the generalized kinetic equation (2) (see discussion in Sec. 5).

2.2. Test particle in a thermal bath: the Fokker-Planck equation

We now consider a “test” particle (tagged particle) evolving in a steady distribution of “field” particles. The test particle has a stochastic motion. We assume the system to be spatially homogeneous. Let us call $P(\mathbf{v}, t)$ the probability density of finding the test

particle with velocity $\mathbf{v}$ at time t . The evolution of $P(\mathbf{v}, t)$ can be obtained from the Lenard-Balescu equation (23) by considering that the distribution f_1 of the field particles is *fixed*. Thus, we replace $f = f(\mathbf{v}, t)$ by $P = P(\mathbf{v}, t)$ and $f_1 = f(\mathbf{v}_1, t)$ by $f_1 = f(\mathbf{v}_1)$ where $f(\mathbf{v})$ is any stable stationary solution of the Vlasov equation. This procedure [73] transforms the integro-differential equation (23) into the differential equation

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial t} = \pi(2\pi)^d m \frac{\partial}{\partial v^\mu} \int k^\mu k^\nu \delta(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{w}) \frac{\hat{u}(\mathbf{k})^2}{|\epsilon(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v})|^2} \left(f_1 \frac{\partial P}{\partial v^\nu} - P \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial v_1^\nu} \right) d\mathbf{v}_1 d\mathbf{k}, \quad (28)$$

where $\epsilon(\mathbf{k}, \omega)$ is the dielectric function corresponding to the fixed distribution function $f(\mathbf{v})$. Equation (28) can be written in the form of a Fokker-Planck equation

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial v^\mu} \left(D^{\mu\nu} \frac{\partial P}{\partial v^\nu} - P \eta^\mu \right), \quad (29)$$

involving a diffusion term

$$D^{\mu\nu} = \pi(2\pi)^d m \int k^\mu k^\nu \delta(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{w}) \frac{\hat{u}(\mathbf{k})^2}{|\epsilon(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v})|^2} f_1 d\mathbf{v}_1 d\mathbf{k}, \quad (30)$$

and a friction term due to the polarization

$$\eta^\mu = F_{pol}^\mu = \pi(2\pi)^d m \int k^\mu k^\nu \delta(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{w}) \frac{\hat{u}(\mathbf{k})^2}{|\epsilon(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v})|^2} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial v_1^\nu} d\mathbf{v}_1 d\mathbf{k}. \quad (31)$$

The diffusion term can be directly derived from the Kubo formula, and the friction force due to the polarization can be directly obtained from a linear response theory, as shown by Kandrup [75] and Chavanis [31]. Since the diffusion coefficient depends on the velocity $\mathbf{v}$ of the test particle, it is useful to rewrite Eq. (29) in a form that is fully consistent with the general Fokker-Planck equation

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial v^\mu \partial v^\nu} \left(P \frac{\langle \Delta v^\mu \Delta v^\nu \rangle}{\Delta t} \right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial v^\mu} \left(P \frac{\langle \Delta v^\mu \rangle}{\Delta t} \right), \quad (32)$$

with

$$\frac{\langle \Delta v^\mu \Delta v^\nu \rangle}{2\Delta t} = D^{\mu\nu}, \quad \frac{\langle \Delta v^\mu \rangle}{\Delta t} = \frac{\partial D^{\mu\nu}}{\partial v^\nu} + \eta^\mu \equiv F_{friction}^\mu. \quad (33)$$

Substituting Eqs. (30) and (31) into Eq. (33), and using an integration by parts, we find that the diffusion and friction coefficients are given by

$$\frac{\langle \Delta v^\mu \Delta v^\nu \rangle}{2\Delta t} = \pi(2\pi)^d m \int k^\mu k^\nu \delta(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{w}) \frac{\hat{u}(\mathbf{k})^2}{|\epsilon(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v})|^2} f_1 d\mathbf{v}_1 d\mathbf{k}, \quad (34)$$

$$\frac{\langle \Delta v^\mu \rangle}{\Delta t} = \pi(2\pi)^d m \int k^\mu k^\nu f_1 \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial v^\nu} - \frac{\partial}{\partial v_1^\nu} \right) \delta(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{w}) \frac{\hat{u}(\mathbf{k})^2}{|\epsilon(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v})|^2} d\mathbf{v}_1 d\mathbf{k}. \quad (35)$$

The two forms (29) and (32) of the Fokker-Planck equation have their own interest. The expression (32) where the diffusion coefficient is placed after the two derivatives $\partial^2(DP)$ involves the total friction force $F_{friction}^\mu = \langle \Delta v^\mu \rangle / \Delta t$ and the expression (29) where the diffusion coefficient is placed between the derivatives $\partial D \partial P$ isolates the part of the friction $\eta^\mu = F_{pol}^\mu$ due to the polarization [32].

In stellar dynamics, the coefficients of diffusion and friction were first obtained by Chandrasekhar [6, 7] by considering the mean effect of a succession of binary encounters. They were also computed by Cohen *et al.* [11] and Rosenbluth *et al.* [9] in a plasma physics context by neglecting collective effects. This leads to expressions that are consistent with Eqs. (34) and (35) with $|\epsilon(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v})|^2 = 1$ (see, e.g., [18] for a discussion of this link). These expressions can also be obtained directly from the Hamiltonian equations of motion by making a systematic expansion of the trajectory of the particles in powers of $1/N$ in the limit $N \rightarrow +\infty$ as shown in Appendix A of [32]. On the other hand, the expressions (34) and (35) for the diffusion and the friction, properly taking into account collective effects, were first derived by Hubbard [5] in plasma physics by directly evaluating $\langle \Delta v^\mu \Delta v^\nu \rangle$ and $\langle \Delta v^\mu \rangle$. Collective effects encapsulated in the dielectric function remove the logarithmic divergence that otherwise appears at large scales. The work of Hubbard [5] was done independently from the works of Lenard [3] and Balescu [4] that were published at about the same time, but they are clearly connected since the equations (34) and (35) of Hubbard [5] can be derived from the Lenard-Balescu equation, and *vis et versa*, as explained above (see also discussion in [32]).

Let us now consider particular cases.

- In $d = 1$, the expressions of the diffusion and friction simplify into

$$D(v) = 4\pi^2 m f(v) \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{k \hat{u}(k)^2}{|\epsilon(k, kv)|^2} dk, \quad (36)$$

$$\eta(v) = 4\pi^2 m f'(v) \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{k \hat{u}(k)^2}{|\epsilon(k, kv)|^2} dk = D(v) \frac{d \ln f}{dv}. \quad (37)$$

$$\frac{\langle \Delta v \rangle}{\Delta t} = D'(v) + D(v) \frac{d \ln f}{dv}, \quad (38)$$

and the Fokker-Planck equation (28) reduces to

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial v} \left[D(v) \left(\frac{\partial P}{\partial v} - P \frac{d \ln f}{dv} \right) \right]. \quad (39)$$

The diffusion and the friction coefficients were derived by Eldridge & Feix [55] for one dimensional plasmas and by Bouchet & Dauxois [52] for the HMF model by directly evaluating $\langle (\Delta v)^2 \rangle$ and $\langle \Delta v \rangle$ (see [50] for detailed calculations). Alternatively, Chavanis [73] (see also [53, 18]) obtains Eqs. (36)-(39) as a particular case of the general expressions (28)-(35) valid in any dimension of space.

- If we neglect collective effects, the diffusion and friction coefficients reduce to

$$D^{\mu\nu} = \pi(2\pi)^d m \int k^\mu k^\nu \delta(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{w}) \hat{u}(\mathbf{k})^2 f_1 d\mathbf{v}_1 d\mathbf{k}, \quad (40)$$

$$\eta^\mu = F_{pol}^\mu = \pi(2\pi)^d m \int k^\mu k^\nu \delta(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{w}) \hat{u}(\mathbf{k})^2 \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial v_1^\nu} d\mathbf{v}_1 d\mathbf{k}, \quad (41)$$

$$F_{friction}^\mu = \pi(2\pi)^d m \int k^\mu k^\nu f_1 \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial v^\nu} - \frac{\partial}{\partial v_1^\nu} \right) \delta(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{w}) \hat{u}(\mathbf{k})^2 d\mathbf{v}_1 d\mathbf{k}. \quad (42)$$

After a series of elementary transformations, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial D^{\mu\nu}}{\partial v^\nu} &= \pi(2\pi)^d m \int k^\mu k^\nu \frac{\partial}{\partial v^\nu} \delta(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{w}) \hat{u}(\mathbf{k})^2 f_1 d\mathbf{v}_1 d\mathbf{k}, \\
&= -\pi(2\pi)^d m \int k^\mu k^\nu \frac{\partial}{\partial v_1^\nu} \delta(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{w}) \hat{u}(\mathbf{k})^2 f_1 d\mathbf{v}_1 d\mathbf{k}, \\
&= \pi(2\pi)^d m \int k^\mu k^\nu \delta(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{w}) \hat{u}(\mathbf{k})^2 \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial v_1^\nu} d\mathbf{v}_1 d\mathbf{k} = \eta^\mu.
\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

Combining Eq. (33) with Eq. (43), we find that

$$\frac{\langle \Delta \mathbf{v} \rangle}{\Delta t} = 2\eta^\mu, \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \mathbf{F}_{friction} = 2\mathbf{F}_{pol}, \tag{44}$$

so that the friction force $\mathbf{F}_{friction}$ is equal to twice the friction due to the polarization $\mathbf{F}_{pol}$. This explains the difference of factor 2 in the calculations of Chandrasekhar [7] and Kandrup [19] (see the anomaly noted by Kandrup [19] p. 446).

• For a thermal bath, the field particles have the Maxwell distribution of statistical equilibrium

$$f(\mathbf{v}_1) = \left(\frac{\beta m}{2\pi} \right)^{d/2} \rho e^{-\beta m \frac{v_1^2}{2}}. \tag{45}$$

Substituting

$$\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial v_1^\nu} = -\beta m f_1 v_1^\nu, \tag{46}$$

in Eq. (31), we obtain

$$\eta^\mu = -\beta \pi (2\pi)^d m^2 \int k^\mu (\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1) \delta[\mathbf{k} \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_1)] \frac{\hat{u}(\mathbf{k})^2}{|\epsilon(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v})|^2} f_1 d\mathbf{v}_1 d\mathbf{k}. \tag{47}$$

Using the δ -function to replace $\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1$ by $\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v}$, we get

$$\eta^\mu = -\beta \pi (2\pi)^d m^2 v^\nu \int k^\mu k^\nu \delta[\mathbf{k} \cdot (\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_1)] \frac{\hat{u}(\mathbf{k})^2}{|\epsilon(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{v})|^2} f_1 d\mathbf{v}_1 d\mathbf{k}. \tag{48}$$

Comparing the resulting expression with Eq. (30), we find that

$$\eta^\mu = -\beta m D^{\mu\nu} v^\nu, \tag{49}$$

which is the appropriate Einstein relation for our problem. Note that it is valid for the friction force due to the polarization $\mathbf{F}_{pol}$, not for the total friction force $\mathbf{F}_{friction}$. The Fokker-Planck equation (28) takes the form

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial v^\mu} \left[D^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{v}) \left(\frac{\partial P}{\partial v^\nu} + \beta m P v^\nu \right) \right], \tag{50}$$

where the diffusion coefficient is given by Eq. (30) with Eq. (45). This is similar to the Kramers equation except that the diffusion coefficient is a tensor and that it depends on the velocity. Some simplified forms of the diffusion coefficient are given in [18] in different dimensions of space d .

3. Two-dimensional point vortices

3.1. The evolution of the system as a whole: the kinetic equation

We consider a system of point vortices described by the Hamiltonian equations

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma \frac{dx_i}{dt} &= \frac{\partial H}{\partial y_i}, & \gamma \frac{dy_i}{dt} &= -\frac{\partial H}{\partial x_i}, \\ H &= \gamma^2 \sum_{i < j} u(\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j). \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

The usual interaction corresponds to $u(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \ln |\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|$ but we let u arbitrary in order to treat more general cases. We consider the proper thermodynamic limit $N \rightarrow +\infty$ in such a way that $V \sim E \sim \beta/N \sim 1$ and $\gamma \sim 1/N$ [65] (for rigorous mathematical results see [76, 77, 78, 79, 80]). When collective effects are ignored, the kinetic equation describing the evolution of the smooth vorticity profile $\omega(\mathbf{r}, t)$ at the order $O(1/N)$ can be written

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial t} + \frac{N-1}{N} \langle \mathbf{V} \rangle \cdot \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial \mathbf{r}} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial r^\mu} \int_0^t d\tau \int d\mathbf{r}_1 V^\mu(1 \rightarrow 0) G(t, t - \tau) \\ &\times \left[\mathcal{V}^\nu(1 \rightarrow 0) \frac{\partial}{\partial r^\nu} + \mathcal{V}^\nu(0 \rightarrow 1) \frac{\partial}{\partial r_1^\nu} \right] \omega(\mathbf{r}, t - \tau) \frac{\omega}{\gamma}(\mathbf{r}_1, t - \tau), \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

where $\mathbf{V}(1 \rightarrow 0)$ is the velocity created by point vortex 1 (located in $\mathbf{r}_1$) on point vortex 0 (located in $\mathbf{r}$) and $\mathcal{V}^\mu(1 \rightarrow 0) = \mathbf{V}(1 \rightarrow 0) - \langle \mathbf{V} \rangle / N$ is the fluctuating velocity with respect to the average velocity $\langle \mathbf{V} \rangle(\mathbf{r}, t) = -\mathbf{z} \times \nabla \psi(\mathbf{r}, t)$ at the location of point vortex 0. On the other hand, $G(t, t - \tau)$ is the Greenian constructed with the mean flow. This kinetic equation has been obtained by Chavanis [39, 40] from a projection operator formalism, a BBGKY-like hierarchy and a quasilinear theory. The BBGKY hierarchy is closed by neglecting the three body correlation function which is of order $O(1/N^2)$. The structure of this equation bears a clear physical meaning. It involves a diffusion term and a drift term. Furthermore, the coefficients of diffusion and drift are given by generalized Kubo formulae, i.e. the time integral of the temporal correlations of the fluctuating velocity. The collision term $C_N[\omega]$ (r.h.s.) is valid at the order $1/N$ so that it describes the “collisional” evolution of the point vortex gas (ignoring collective effects) on a timescale of order Nt_D . For $N \rightarrow +\infty$, we obtain the 2D Euler equation in which collisions (more properly correlations) are neglected. The 2D Euler-Poisson system can generate a process of violent relaxation towards a quasi stationary state as described by Miller [81] and Robert & Sommeria [82]. This is the hydrodynamical counterpart of the Lynden-Bell [71] theory of violent relaxation in stellar dynamics (see, e.g. [83, 45], for a description of this analogy). Equation (52) is a non Markovian integro-differential equation. It can describe the dynamics of point vortices taking into account delocalizations in space and time (i.e. non-axisymmetry and memory effects). This kinetic equation is the vortex analogue of the generalized Landau equation (2) for stellar systems. If we make the Markovian approximation and extend the time integral

to $+\infty$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial t} + \frac{N-1}{N} \langle \mathbf{V} \rangle \cdot \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial \mathbf{r}} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial r^\mu} \int_0^{+\infty} d\tau \int d\mathbf{r}_1 V^\mu(1 \rightarrow 0) G(t, t - \tau) \\ &\times \left[\mathcal{V}^\nu(1 \rightarrow 0) \frac{\partial}{\partial r^\nu} + \mathcal{V}^\nu(0 \rightarrow 1) \frac{\partial}{\partial r_1^\nu} \right] \omega(\mathbf{r}, t) \frac{\omega}{\gamma}(\mathbf{r}_1, t). \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

The Markovian approximation may not be justified in any situation since it has been shown numerically that point vortices can exhibit long jumps (Lévy flights) and correlations (see Sec. 5 for a more detailed discussion). However, for $N \rightarrow +\infty$, the Markovian approximation should be justified because the timescale $\sim Nt_D$ on which $\omega(\mathbf{r}, t)$ changes is long compared to the timescale τ_{corr} for which the integrand in Eq. (52) has significant support. The Markovian equation (53) still applies to possibly non-axisymmetric distributions, which is the norm for 2D flows. Now, for axisymmetric distributions $\omega(r, t)$, the kinetic equation reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial t} &= \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} r \int_0^{+\infty} d\tau \int d\mathbf{r}_1 V_r(1 \rightarrow 0) G(t, t - \tau) \\ &\times \left[V_r(1 \rightarrow 0) \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + V_{r_1}(0 \rightarrow 1) \frac{\partial}{\partial r_1} \right] \omega(r, t) \frac{\omega}{\gamma}(r_1, t). \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

Using $V_{r_1}(0 \rightarrow 1) = -\frac{r}{r_1} V_r(1 \rightarrow 0)$ (see below) and the equation of the unperturbed trajectory

$$r(t - \tau) = r(t) = r, \quad \theta(t - \tau) = \theta(t) - \Omega(r, t)\tau = \theta - \Omega(r, t)\tau, \quad (55)$$

corresponding to $\langle \mathbf{V} \rangle = V(r, t) \mathbf{e}_\theta$ with $V(r, t) = \Omega(r, t)r$ (where Ω is the angular velocity), the kinetic equation can be written

$$\frac{\partial \omega}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \int_0^{+\infty} r_1 dr_1 K \left(\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} - \frac{1}{r_1} \frac{\partial}{\partial r_1} \right) \omega(r, t) \frac{\omega}{\gamma}(r_1, t), \quad (56)$$

with

$$K = r^2 \int_0^{+\infty} d\tau \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta_1 V_r(1 \rightarrow 0, t) V_r(1 \rightarrow 0, t - \tau). \quad (57)$$

In consistency with the Markov approximation, we have assumed that the angular velocity $\Omega(r, t)$ does not change on the timescale τ_{corr} on which the velocity correlations have their support. The velocity created by point vortex 1 on point vortex 0 is given by $\mathbf{V}(1 \rightarrow 0) = -\gamma \mathbf{z} \times \nabla u(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_1)$ leading to

$$V_r(1 \rightarrow 0) = \frac{\gamma}{r} \frac{\partial u}{\partial \theta}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_1). \quad (58)$$

The potential of interaction is of the form $u(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_1) = u(r, r_1, \theta - \theta_1)$. It depends on $\cos(\theta - \theta_1)$ and is invariant with respect to the interchange of 0 and 1. Introducing the Fourier transform with respect to the angles

$$u(r, r_1, \phi) = \sum_m e^{im\phi} \hat{u}_m(r, r_1), \quad \hat{u}_m(r, r_1) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} u(r, r_1, \phi) \cos(m\phi) d\phi, \quad (59)$$

we get

$$V_r(1 \rightarrow 0, s) = i \frac{\gamma}{r(s)} \sum_m m e^{im(\theta(s) - \theta_1(s))} \hat{u}_m(r(s), r_1(s)). \quad (60)$$

Using the equations of motion (55), and introducing $\phi = \theta - \theta_1$ and $\Delta\Omega = \Omega(r, t) - \Omega(r_1, t)$, we obtain

$$V_r(1 \rightarrow 0, t - \tau) = i \frac{\gamma}{r} \sum_m m e^{im(\phi - \Delta\Omega\tau)} \hat{u}_m(r, r_1). \quad (61)$$

Therefore

$$K = -\gamma^2 \int_0^{+\infty} d\tau \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi \sum_{mn} m n e^{im\phi} e^{in(\phi - \Delta\Omega\tau)} \hat{u}_m(r, r_1) \hat{u}_n(r, r_1). \quad (62)$$

Using the identity

$$\delta_{n,0} = \int_0^{2\pi} e^{in\theta} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi}, \quad (63)$$

and integrating on ϕ , then summing on n , we find that

$$K = 2\pi\gamma^2 \int_0^{+\infty} d\tau \sum_m m^2 e^{im\Delta\Omega\tau} \hat{u}_m(r, r_1) \hat{u}_{-m}(r, r_1). \quad (64)$$

Since $\hat{u}_{-m}(r, r_1) = \hat{u}_m(r, r_1)$, the foregoing equation can be rewritten

$$K = 2\pi\gamma^2 \int_0^{+\infty} d\tau \sum_m m^2 e^{im\Delta\Omega\tau} \hat{u}_m(r, r_1)^2. \quad (65)$$

Making the transformation $\tau \rightarrow -\tau$, then $m \rightarrow -m$, and adding the resulting expression to Eq. (65), we get

$$K = \pi\gamma^2 \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\tau \sum_m m^2 e^{im\Delta\Omega\tau} \hat{u}_m(r, r_1)^2. \quad (66)$$

Using the identity (13), we finally obtain

$$K = 2\pi^2\gamma^2 \sum_m m^2 \delta(m\Delta\Omega) \hat{u}_m(r, r_1)^2. \quad (67)$$

Therefore, the kinetic equation takes the form

$$\frac{\partial\omega}{\partial t} = 2\pi^2\gamma \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \int_0^{+\infty} r_1 dr_1 \chi(r, r_1) \delta(\Omega - \Omega_1) \left(\frac{1}{r} \omega_1 \frac{\partial\omega}{\partial r} - \frac{1}{r_1} \omega \frac{\partial\omega_1}{\partial r_1} \right), \quad (68)$$

with

$$\chi(r, r_1) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{+\infty} |m| \hat{u}_m(r, r_1)^2, \quad (69)$$

where we have used the identity $\delta(\lambda x) = \frac{1}{|\lambda|} \delta(x)$ and noted $\omega = \omega(r, t)$, $\omega_1 = \omega(r_1, t)$, $\Omega = \Omega(r, t)$ and $\Omega_1 = \Omega(r_1, t)$. The calculation of $\chi(r, r_1)$ is detailed in Appendix B for the ordinary potential $u(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \ln(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}')$. Equation (68) has been derived by Chavanis [39]. It is the vortex analogue of the Landau equation (18). A more general kinetic equation, taking into account collective effects, has been derived by Dubin & O'Neil [38] by a different method. It is the vortex analogue of the Lenard-Balescu equation (23). The kinetic equation (68) conserves circulation $\Gamma = \int \omega d\mathbf{r}$, energy $E = \frac{1}{2} \int \omega \psi d\mathbf{r}$ and angular momentum $L = \int \omega r^2 d\mathbf{r}$, and monotonically increases the

Boltzmann entropy $S = - \int \frac{\omega}{\gamma} \ln \frac{\omega}{\gamma} d\mathbf{r}$ (H -theorem). The collisional evolution is due to a condition of resonance between distant orbits of the point vortices. For axisymmetric systems, the condition of resonance encapsulated in the δ -function corresponds to $\Omega(r, t) = \Omega(r_1, t)$ with $r \neq r_1$. The evolution stops when the profile of angular velocity becomes monotonic (so that there is no resonance) even if the system has not reached the statistical equilibrium state given by the Boltzmann distribution [33]. This “kinetic blocking” has been illustrated numerically in [41]. Indeed, the Boltzmann distribution $\omega = Ae^{-\beta\gamma(\psi + \frac{1}{2}\Omega_L r^2)}$ is not the unique steady state of the kinetic equation (68): any vorticity distribution associated with a monotonic profile of angular velocity is a steady state of Eq. (68). In particular, if the profile of angular velocity is initially monotonic^{††}, the collision term $C_N[\omega]$ vanishes at the order $1/N$ because there is no resonance [39]. The kinetic equation reduces to $\partial\omega/\partial t = 0$ so that the vorticity does not evolve at all on a timescale $\sim Nt_D$. This implies that, for axisymmetric distributions of point vortices, the relaxation time towards statistical equilibrium is larger than Nt_D . We therefore expect that

$$t_R > Nt_D \quad (\text{axisymmetric flows}). \quad (70)$$

For non axisymmetric distributions, the relaxation time can be reduced and approach the natural scaling Nt_D associated with the generalized kinetic equation (52) (see discussion in Sec. 5). In any case, for $N \gg 1$, the relaxation towards the Boltzmann distribution is a very slow process. The possible slow timescale of mixing was pointed out by Onsager in a letter to Lin [37]: “*I still have to find out whether the processes anticipated by these considerations are rapid enough to play a dominant role in the evolution.*” and it is now confirmed by the kinetic theory (as far as we know, the process of violent relaxation [71, 81, 82] was not foreseen by Onsager who focused on the ordinary statistical equilibrium state). In fact, the scaling of the relaxation time with N is still not known for axisymmetric distributions and it would be interesting to obtain it numerically. It is not even clear whether the system of point vortices truly relaxes towards the Boltzmann distribution predicted by statistical mechanics [33]. Indeed, as discussed by Khanin [42], the dynamics may be non-ergodic. This was also a concern of Onsager: “*We inquire about the ergodic motion of the system,*” Onsager wrote to Lin [37].

3.2. Relaxation of a test vortex in a thermal bath: the Fokker-Planck equation

We now consider the relaxation of a “test” vortex (tagged particle) evolving in a steady distribution of “field” vortices. The test vortex has a stochastic motion. Let us call $P(\mathbf{r}, t)$ the probability density of finding the test vortex at position $\mathbf{r}$ at time t . For axisymmetric distributions, the evolution of $P(\mathbf{r}, t)$ can be obtained from the kinetic equation (68) by considering that the distribution of the field vortices ω_1 is *fixed*. Thus, we replace $\omega = \omega(r, t)$ by $P = P(r, t)$ and $\omega_1 = \omega(r_1, t)$ by $\omega_1 = \omega(r_1)$ where $\omega(r)$ is any

^{††}This is the generic case because the process of violent relaxation usually leads to an axisymmetric QSS with a monotonic profile of angular velocity.

stable stationary solution of the 2D Euler equation. This procedure [39, 41] transforms the integro-differential equation (68) into the differential equation

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial t} = 2\pi^2\gamma \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \int_0^{+\infty} r_1 dr_1 \chi(r, r_1) \delta(\Omega - \Omega_1) \left(\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} - \frac{1}{r_1} \frac{\partial}{\partial r_1} \right) P(r, t) \omega(r_1). \quad (71)$$

This is the vortex analogue of Eq. (28). Equation (71) can be written in the form of a Fokker-Planck equation

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left[r \left(D \frac{\partial P}{\partial r} - P \eta \right) \right], \quad (72)$$

involving a diffusion term

$$D = \frac{2\pi^2\gamma}{r^2} \int_0^{+\infty} r_1 dr_1 \chi(r, r_1) \delta(\Omega - \Omega_1) \omega(r_1), \quad (73)$$

and a drift term due to the polarization

$$\eta \equiv V_r^{pol} = \frac{2\pi^2\gamma}{r} \int_0^{+\infty} dr_1 \chi(r, r_1) \delta(\Omega - \Omega_1) \frac{d\omega}{dr}(r_1). \quad (74)$$

The diffusion coefficient can be directly derived from the Kubo formula and the drift velocity due to the polarization can be directly derived from a linear response theory [43, 39, 40]. Since the diffusion coefficient depends on the position r of the test vortex, it is useful to rewrite Eq. (71) in a form that is fully consistent with the general Fokker-Planck equation

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{2r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left[r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(\frac{\langle (\Delta r)^2 \rangle}{\Delta t} P \right) \right] - \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(r P \frac{\langle \Delta r \rangle}{\Delta t} \right), \quad (75)$$

with

$$\frac{\langle (\Delta r)^2 \rangle}{2\Delta t} = D, \quad \frac{\langle \Delta r \rangle}{\Delta t} = \frac{\partial D}{\partial r} + \eta \equiv V_r^{drift}. \quad (76)$$

Substituting Eqs. (73) and (74) in Eq. (76), and using an integration by parts, we find that the diffusion and drift coefficients are given by

$$\frac{\langle (\Delta r)^2 \rangle}{2\Delta t} = \frac{2\pi^2\gamma}{r^2} \int_0^{+\infty} r_1 dr_1 \chi(r, r_1) \delta(\Omega - \Omega_1) \omega(r_1), \quad (77)$$

$$\frac{\langle \Delta r \rangle}{\Delta t} = 2\pi^2\gamma \int_0^{+\infty} r r_1 dr_1 \omega_1 \left(\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} - \frac{1}{r_1} \frac{\partial}{\partial r_1} \right) \chi(r, r_1) \delta(\Omega - \Omega_1) \frac{1}{r^2}. \quad (78)$$

The two forms (72) and (75) of the Fokker-Planck equation are interesting to consider as they involve respectively the drift due to the polarization V_r^{pol} or the total drift V_r^{drift} [40]. Expressions (77) and (78) for the diffusion coefficient and the drift term can be obtained directly from the Hamiltonian equations, by making a systematic expansion of the trajectories of the point vortices in powers of $1/N$ in the limit $N \rightarrow +\infty$ as shown in Appendix C of [41].

Let us now consider particular cases.

• If the profile of angular velocity of the field vortices $\Omega(r)$ is monotonic, using the identity $\delta(\Omega - \Omega_1) = \delta(r - r_1)/|\Omega'(r)|$, we find that the expressions of the diffusion and drift simplify into

$$D(r) = 2\pi^2\gamma \frac{\chi(r, r)}{|\Sigma(r)|} \omega(r), \quad (79)$$

$$\eta = 2\pi^2\gamma \frac{\chi(r, r)}{|\Sigma(r)|} \omega'(r) = D(r) \frac{d \ln \omega}{dr}, \quad (80)$$

$$\frac{\langle \Delta r \rangle}{\Delta t} = D'(r) + D(r) \frac{d \ln \omega}{dr}, \quad (81)$$

where $\Sigma(r) = r\Omega'(r)$ is the local shear. The Fokker-Planck equation (71) can then be written

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left[r D(r) \left(\frac{\partial P}{\partial r} - P \frac{d \ln \omega}{dr} \right) \right], \quad (82)$$

with a diffusion coefficient given by Eq. (79). Equation (82) is the vortex analogue of Eq. (39). The expressions (79) and (80) of the diffusion coefficient and of the drift, *that are inversely proportional to the shear*, were first derived for a thermal bath in [43] and for an arbitrary distribution of the field vortices in [39] (see remark before Eq. (123)). For the usual potential of interaction (see Appendix B), we have $\chi(r, r) = \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln \Lambda$ where $\ln \Lambda = \sum_{m=1}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{m}$ is a Coulombian logarithm that has to be regularized appropriately. It scales like $\ln \Lambda \sim \frac{1}{2} \ln N$ (see, e.g. [41]).

• For a thermal bath, the field vortices have the Boltzmann distribution of statistical equilibrium

$$\omega(r_1) = A\gamma e^{-\beta\gamma\psi'(r_1)}, \quad (83)$$

where $\psi'(r_1) = \psi(r_1) + \frac{\Omega_L}{2} r_1^2$ is the relative stream function taking into account the invariance by rotation [41]. We have

$$\frac{d\omega_1}{dr_1} = -\beta\gamma\omega(r_1) \frac{d\psi'_1}{dr_1} = \beta\gamma\omega(r_1)(\Omega(r_1) - \Omega_L)r_1, \quad (84)$$

where we have used $\Omega(r) = V(r)/r = -(1/r)d\psi/dr$. Substituting this relation in Eq. (74), we obtain

$$\eta = \beta \frac{2\pi^2\gamma^2}{r} \int_0^{+\infty} dr_1 \chi(r, r_1) \delta(\Omega - \Omega_1) \omega_1 (\Omega_1 - \Omega_L) r_1. \quad (85)$$

Using the δ -function to replace Ω_1 by Ω , then using $\Omega(r) - \Omega_L = -(1/r)d\psi'/dr$, and comparing the resulting expression with Eq. (73), we finally find that

$$\eta = -D\beta\gamma \frac{d\psi'}{dr}. \quad (86)$$

The drift is perpendicular to the relative mean field velocity $\langle \mathbf{V}' \rangle = -(d\psi'/dr)\mathbf{e}_\theta$ and the drift coefficient satisfies an Einstein relation $\xi = D\beta\gamma$ [43]. We stress that the Einstein relation is valid for the drift $V_r^{pol} = \eta$ due to the polarization [40], not for the

total drift V_r^{drift} . For a thermal bath, using Eq. (86), the Fokker-Planck equation (72) takes the form

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left[r D(r) \left(\frac{\partial P}{\partial r} + \beta \gamma P \frac{d\psi'}{dr} \right) \right], \quad (87)$$

where $D(r)$ is given by Eq. (73) with Eq. (83). Of course, if the profile of angular velocity of the Boltzmann distribution is monotonic, we find that Eq. (80) with Eq. (83) returns Eq. (86) with a diffusion coefficient given by Eq. (79) with Eq. (83). Note that the systematic drift $\mathbf{V}_{pol} = -D\beta\gamma\nabla\psi'$ of a point vortex [43] is the counterpart of the dynamical friction $\mathbf{F}_{pol} = -D_{\parallel}\beta m\mathbf{v}$ of a star [7] and the Fokker-Planck equation (87) is the counterpart of the Fokker-Planck equation (50).

We have presented the results for axisymmetric distributions, but similar results can be obtained for unidirectional flows [43, 39].

4. Kinetic equation with angle-action variables

4.1. Evolution of the system as a whole: the kinetic equation

The kinetic equation (18) derived in Sec. 2 is valid for spatially homogeneous systems. A manner to describe spatially inhomogeneous systems is to use angle-action variables (ϕ, J) . A kinetic equation for $f(J, t)$ has been derived by Chavanis [64] by using two different strategies: (i) by incorporating in a Fokker-Planck equation the expressions of the coefficients of diffusion and friction obtained by Valageas [84] or, (ii) by starting from the Klimontovich equation, using a quasilinear theory, and solving the equations with Laplace-Fourier transforms. However, the second derivation presents some shortcomings that were explicitly discussed in [64]. In particular, a factorization hypothesis is used without precise justification. Here, we show that, when collective effects are neglected, the kinetic equation in angle-action variables can be derived from the general equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial J} \int_0^{+\infty} d\tau \int d\phi_1 dJ_1 F(1 \rightarrow 0) G(t, t - \tau) \\ &\times \left[F(1 \rightarrow 0) \frac{\partial}{\partial J} + F(0 \rightarrow 1) \frac{\partial}{\partial J_1} \right] f(J, t) \frac{f}{m}(J_1, t), \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

with

$$F(1 \rightarrow 0) = -m \frac{\partial u}{\partial \phi} (x(J, \phi) - x(J_1, \phi_1)). \quad (89)$$

Not only the present approach solves the problems of our former approach [64], but it also shows a nice unity with the kinetic theories developed in Secs. 2 and 3. Indeed, the kinetic equation (88) is the analogue of the kinetic equations (3) and (53). For simplicity, we consider one-dimensional systems but we shall indicate at the end how our results can be generalized in d dimensions. Introducing the Fourier transform of the potential with respect to the angles

$$u(x(J, \phi) - x(J_1, \phi_1)) = \sum_{n, n_1} A_{n, n_1}(J, J_1) e^{i(n\phi - n_1\phi_1)}, \quad (90)$$

where

$$A_{n,n_1}(J, J_1) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int u(x(J, \phi) - x(J_1, \phi_1)) e^{-i(n\phi - n_1\phi_1)} d\phi d\phi_1, \quad (91)$$

we get

$$F(1 \rightarrow 0) = -im \sum_{n,n_1} A_{n,n_1}(J, J_1) n e^{i(n\phi - n_1\phi_1)}. \quad (92)$$

Substituting this expression in the kinetic equation (88), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} = & -m^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial J} \int_0^{+\infty} d\tau \int d\phi_1 dJ_1 \sum_{n,n_1} \sum_{l,l_1} A_{n,n_1}(J, J_1) n e^{i(n\phi - n_1\phi_1)} G(t, t - \tau) \\ & \times \left[A_{l,l_1}(J, J_1) l e^{i(l\phi - l_1\phi_1)} \frac{\partial}{\partial J} + A_{l_1,l}(J_1, J) l_1 e^{i(l_1\phi_1 - l\phi)} \frac{\partial}{\partial J_1} \right] f(J, t) \frac{f}{m}(J_1, t). \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

With angle-action variables, the equations of motion take a very simple form

$$J(t - \tau) = J(t) = J, \quad \phi(t - \tau) = \phi(t) - \Omega(J, t)\tau = \phi - \Omega(J, t)\tau, \quad (94)$$

where $2\pi\Omega^{-1}(J, t)$ is the period of the orbit with action J . Substituting these relations in Eq. (93) and making the transformations $l \rightarrow -l$ and $l_1 \rightarrow -l_1$ in the second integral (friction term), we obtain successively

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} = & -m^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial J} \int_0^{+\infty} d\tau \int d\phi_1 dJ_1 \sum_{n,n_1} \sum_{l,l_1} A_{n,n_1}(J, J_1) n e^{i(n\phi - n_1\phi_1)} \\ & \times e^{i(l\phi(t-\tau) - l_1\phi_1(t-\tau))} \left[A_{l,l_1}(J, J_1) l \frac{\partial}{\partial J} - A_{-l_1,-l}(J_1, J) l_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial J_1} \right] f(J, t) \frac{f}{m}(J_1, t), \end{aligned} \quad (95)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} = & -m^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial J} \int_0^{+\infty} d\tau \int d\phi_1 dJ_1 \sum_{n,n_1} \sum_{l,l_1} A_{n,n_1}(J, J_1) n e^{i(n\phi - n_1\phi_1)} e^{i(l\phi - l_1\phi_1)} \\ & e^{-i(l\Omega(J,t) - l_1\Omega(J_1,t))\tau} \left[A_{l,l_1}(J, J_1) l \frac{\partial}{\partial J} - A_{-l_1,-l}(J_1, J) l_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial J_1} \right] f(J, t) \frac{f}{m}(J_1, t). \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

It is easy to establish that

$$A_{n_1,n}(J_1, J) = A_{-n,-n_1}(J, J_1) = A_{n,n_1}(J, J_1)^*. \quad (97)$$

Therefore, the kinetic equation can be rewritten

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} = & -m^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial J} \int_0^{+\infty} d\tau \int d\phi_1 dJ_1 \sum_{n,n_1} \sum_{l,l_1} A_{n,n_1}(J, J_1) n e^{i(n+l)\phi} e^{-i(n_1+l_1)\phi_1} \\ & \times e^{-i(l\Omega(J,t) - l_1\Omega(J_1,t))\tau} A_{l,l_1}(J, J_1) \left(l \frac{\partial}{\partial J} - l_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial J_1} \right) f(J, t) \frac{f}{m}(J_1, t). \end{aligned} \quad (98)$$

Integrating on ϕ_1 and using the fact that average distribution does not depend on ϕ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} &= 2\pi m^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial J} \int_0^{+\infty} d\tau \int dJ_1 \sum_{n,n_1} |A_{n,n_1}(J, J_1)|^2 n \\ &\times e^{i(n\Omega(J,t) - n_1\Omega(J_1,t))\tau} \left(n \frac{\partial}{\partial J} - n_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial J_1} \right) f(J, t) \frac{f}{m}(J_1, t). \end{aligned} \quad (99)$$

Making the transformation $\tau \rightarrow -\tau$, then $(n, n_1) \rightarrow (-n, -n_1)$, and adding the resulting expression to Eq. (99), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} &= \pi m^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial J} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\tau \int dJ_1 \sum_{n,n_1} |A_{n,n_1}(J, J_1)|^2 n \\ &\times e^{i(n\Omega(J,t) - n_1\Omega(J_1,t))\tau} \left(n \frac{\partial}{\partial J} - n_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial J_1} \right) f(J, t) \frac{f}{m}(J_1, t). \end{aligned} \quad (100)$$

Using the identity (13), we finally obtain the kinetic equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} &= 2\pi^2 m \frac{\partial}{\partial J} \int dJ_1 \sum_{n,n_1} |A_{n,n_1}(J, J_1)|^2 n \\ &\times \delta(n\Omega(J, t) - n_1\Omega(J_1, t)) \left(n f_1 \frac{\partial f}{\partial J} - n_1 f \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial J_1} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (101)$$

which returns the result obtained in [64]. However, it is derived here in a more satisfactory manner. In d dimensions, n, J, Ω are replaced by vectors and the coefficient $2\pi^2$ is replaced by $\pi(2\pi)^d$.

The kinetic equation (101) conserves mass and energy and monotonically increases the Boltzmann entropy (H -theorem) [64]. The collisional evolution is due to a condition of resonance encapsulated in the δ -function. The evolution stops when this condition of resonance cannot be satisfied anymore even if the system has not reached the statistical equilibrium state given by the Boltzmann distribution. Indeed, the Boltzmann distribution is not the only steady state of Eq. (101): any distribution satisfying $n\Omega(J, t) \neq n_1\Omega(J_1, t)$ for any couples $(n, J) \neq (n_1, J_1)$ is a steady state. However, the important point that we want to make here (it will be discussed further in Sec. 5) is that, for inhomogeneous systems, there generically exists much more resonances than for homogeneous systems. In particular, for one dimensional homogeneous systems, there is no resonance at all (see Sec. 2). We therefore expect that the relaxation time will be reduced for inhomogeneous 1D systems as compared to homogeneous 1D systems. In fact, we cannot conclude that Eq. (101) tends to the Boltzmann distribution (since it is not the only steady state) but since entropy increases while energy and mass are conserved the system is expected to *approach* the Boltzmann distribution on the natural timescale Nt_D on which Eq. (101) is valid, provided that there are enough resonances. Indeed, due to “collisions” and resonances, the system becomes “more mixed”. These arguments will be further discussed in Sec. 5 in the light of existing numerical results.

4.2. Relaxation of a particle in a thermal bath: the Fokker-Planck equation

Implementing a test particle approach like in Secs. 2.2 and 3.2, we find that the equation for $P(J, t)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial P}{\partial t} = & 2\pi^2 m \frac{\partial}{\partial J} \int dJ_1 \sum_{n, n_1} |A_{n, n_1}(J, J_1)|^2 n \\ & \times \delta(n\Omega(J) - n_1\Omega(J_1)) \left(n f_1 \frac{\partial P}{\partial J} - n_1 P \frac{df_1}{dJ_1} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (102)$$

Equation (102) can be written in the form of a Fokker-Planck equation

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial J} \left(D \frac{\partial P}{\partial J} - P \eta \right), \quad (103)$$

involving a diffusion term

$$D = 2\pi^2 m \int dJ_1 \sum_{n, n_1} |A_{n, n_1}(J, J_1)|^2 n^2 \delta(n\Omega(J) - n_1\Omega(J_1)) f_1, \quad (104)$$

and a friction term due to polarization

$$\eta \equiv F^{pol} = 2\pi^2 m \int dJ_1 \sum_{n, n_1} |A_{n, n_1}(J, J_1)|^2 n \delta(n\Omega(J) - n_1\Omega(J_1)) n_1 \frac{df_1}{dJ_1}. \quad (105)$$

The ordinary Fokker-Planck equation is

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial J^2} \left(\frac{\langle (\Delta J)^2 \rangle}{\Delta t} P \right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial J} \left(P \frac{\langle \Delta J \rangle}{\Delta t} \right), \quad (106)$$

with

$$\frac{\langle (\Delta J)^2 \rangle}{2\Delta t} = D, \quad \frac{\langle \Delta J \rangle}{\Delta t} = \frac{dD}{dJ} + \eta \equiv F^{friction}. \quad (107)$$

Substituting Eqs. (104) and (105) in Eq. (107) and using an integration by parts, we find that the diffusion and friction coefficients are given by

$$\frac{\langle (\Delta J)^2 \rangle}{2\Delta t} = 2\pi^2 m \int dJ_1 f_1 \sum_{n, n_1} |A_{n, n_1}(J, J_1)|^2 n^2 \delta(n\Omega(J) - n_1\Omega(J_1)), \quad (108)$$

$$\frac{\langle \Delta J \rangle}{\Delta t} = 2\pi^2 m \int dJ_1 f_1 \sum_{n, n_1} \left(n \frac{\partial}{\partial J} - n_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial J_1} \right) |A_{n, n_1}(J, J_1)|^2 n \delta(n\Omega(J) - n_1\Omega(J_1)). \quad (109)$$

These expressions can be obtained directly from the Hamiltonian equations of motion by making a systematic expansion of the trajectory of the particles in powers of $1/N$ in the limit $N \rightarrow +\infty$ [84].

Let us consider particular cases.

• If we consider a distribution of field particles $f(J_1)$ such that there is no resonance: $n\Omega(J) \neq n_1\Omega(J_1)$ for any couple $(n, J) \neq (n_1, J_1)$, we first get

$$D = 2\pi^2 m \int dJ_1 \sum_n |A_{n, n}(J, J_1)|^2 n^2 \delta(n(\Omega(J) - \Omega(J_1))) f_1. \quad (110)$$

Then, using the identity $\delta(n(\Omega - \Omega_1)) = \delta(J - J_1)/|n\Omega'(J)|$, we find that

$$D(J) = 2\pi^2 m f(J) \sum_n |n| \frac{|A_{n,n}(J, J)|^2}{|\Omega'(J)|}. \quad (111)$$

Similarly

$$\eta = 2\pi^2 m f'(J) \sum_n |n| \frac{|A_{n,n}(J, J)|^2}{|\Omega'(J)|} = D(J) \frac{d \ln f}{dJ}. \quad (112)$$

Using Eq. (107), we obtain

$$\frac{\langle \Delta J \rangle}{\Delta t} = D'(J) + D(J) \frac{d \ln f}{dJ}. \quad (113)$$

Finally, the Fokker-Planck equation (103) can be written

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial J} \left[D(J) \left(\frac{\partial P}{\partial J} - P \frac{d \ln f}{dJ} \right) \right], \quad (114)$$

with a diffusion coefficient given by Eq. (110).

• If the field particles are at statistical equilibrium (thermal bath), their distribution is the Boltzmann distribution

$$f(J_1) = A e^{-\beta m \epsilon(J_1)}, \quad (115)$$

where $\epsilon(J)$ is the individual energy of the orbit with action J . Using $d\epsilon/dJ = \Omega(J)$, we find that

$$\frac{df_1}{dJ_1} = -\beta m f_1 \frac{d\epsilon_1}{dJ_1} = -\beta m f_1 \Omega(J_1). \quad (116)$$

Substituting this relation in Eq. (105), we obtain

$$\eta = -2\pi^2 m^2 \beta \int dJ_1 \sum_{n, n_1} |A_{n, n_1}(J, J_1)|^2 n \delta(n\Omega(J) - n_1\Omega(J_1)) n_1 f_1 \Omega(J_1). \quad (117)$$

Using the δ -function to replace $n_1\Omega(J_1)$ by $n\Omega(J)$ and comparing the resulting expression with Eq. (104), we finally get

$$\eta = -D\beta m \Omega(J), \quad (118)$$

which is the appropriate Einstein relation for our problem. For a thermal bath, using Eq. (118), the Fokker-Planck equation (103) can be written

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial J} \left[D(J) \left(\frac{\partial P}{\partial J} + \beta m P \Omega(J) \right) \right], \quad (119)$$

where $D(J)$ is given by Eq. (104) with Eq. (115).

5. Discussion and conclusion

The kinetic theory of systems with long-range interactions leads to the following scenario:

1. The first stage of the dynamical evolution is described by the Vlasov equation. Due to violent relaxation and phase mixing, the coarse-grained distribution function

$\bar{f}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}, t)$ converges towards a steady state $\bar{f}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v})$ which is a dynamically stable (robust) steady state of the Vlasov equation. The convergence takes a few dynamical times t_D independent of N . The fine-grained distribution $f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}, t)$ develops filaments at smaller and smaller scales and does not achieve a steady state (presumably). This collisionless relaxation explains the rapid emergence of coherent structures in stellar dynamics (galaxies), two-dimensional turbulence (jets and vortices) and in the HMF model (quasistationary states).

2. If the system mixes efficiently, the QSS is given by the Lynden-Bell statistical theory of the Vlasov equation. This is the usual Boltzmann approach taking into account the specificities of the Vlasov equation (Casimir constraints). Therefore, the Lynden-Bell prediction depends on the *details* of the initial condition, not only on the mass and energy. However, violent relaxation can be incomplete: the system may not mix well and the collisionless relaxation may not be ergodic. In that case, other distributions can emerge. Among them, the Tsallis distributions (polytropes) seem to play a particular role in certain situations. However, they are not universal attractors. Other distributions can emerge as well but they are difficult to predict since they depend on the dynamics and on the efficiency of mixing.

3. On longer timescales, the system evolves under the effect of “collisions”, i.e. correlations due to graininess (finite N) effects. This gives rise to a collision term in the r.h.s. of the Vlasov equation. In principle, the collisional relaxation is towards the Boltzmann statistical equilibrium state (for stellar systems, the relaxation towards Boltzmann equilibrium is hampered by the problems of evaporation and gravothermal catastrophe). The collisional relaxation time $t_R(N)$ depends on the number of particles N and diverges rapidly as $N \rightarrow +\infty$.

4. Due to the huge timescale separation between the dynamical time t_D and the relaxation time $t_R(N)$, the distribution function $f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}, t)$ passes by a sequence of quasi equilibrium states which are quasi stationary states of the Vlasov equation slowly evolving in time due to finite N effects (graininess). In stellar dynamics, this collisional evolution is described by the orbit-averaged-Fokker-Planck equation.

This scenario was put forward by Hénon [23, 85] in the context of stellar dynamics and further discussed and improved by many authors. It has become the “standard scenario” of stellar dynamics [86, 87]. A similar scenario was proposed by Chavanis [39, 45] for two-dimensional point vortices, by developing the analogy between the dynamics of stellar systems and point vortices. Inspired by these results, this scenario was also considered by Yamaguchi *et al.* [57] in relation to the HMF model. These authors understood many important aspects of the dynamics. However, we would like to complete some of their arguments in the light of more recent observations: (i) Yamaguchi *et al.* [57] argue that, during the collisional evolution, the system remains always close to a *stable* steady state of the Vlasov equation. Recently, the numerical study of Campa *et al.* [72] has demonstrated that, during the collisional evolution, the distribution function $f(v, t)$ can be well-represented by a Tsallis [88] distribution (polytrope) with a time dependent index $q(t)$ until it becomes Vlasov *unstable* and

triggers a dynamical phase transition from the non magnetized (homogeneous) phase to the magnetized (inhomogeneous) phase. Therefore, in that case, the relaxation involves a *dynamical instability* [72]. In fact, at the verge of the dynamical phase transition, the imaginary part of the complex pulsation ω_i becomes zero and it is possible that the system remains *marginally stable* in the subsequent evolution (this would be an interesting point to check). (ii) Yamaguchi *et al.* [57] reject the possibility of Tsallis q -distributions [88] although they seem to play an important role in the HMF model as discussed in [89]. (iii) They argue that the relaxation time scales algebraically like $N^{1.7}$ although, as we shall see below, the picture is more complex.

We also emphasize that the above scenario is not the only possibility and that, as reviewed in [90, 31], the evolution can be more complex with the formation of phase space holes, periodic solutions, oscillations, vortex crystals etc.

We would like now to use the kinetic theory presented in the present paper to interpret the results of numerical simulations that have been obtained in different contexts. We briefly review these numerical results, then provide new interpretations that can open interesting directions of research.

Stellar systems: the scenario proposed by Hénon [23, 85] has been studied by several authors. The theory of violent relaxation developed by Lynden-Bell [71] explains the isothermal core of elliptical galaxies without recourse to collisions that operate on a much longer timescale. However, his theory does not explain the structure of the halo that results from *incomplete relaxation*. The velocity distribution in the halo is radially anisotropic and the density profile decreases like r^{-4} (instead of the r^{-2} isothermal law). Theories of incomplete relaxation have been elaborated by Stiavelli & Bertin [91], Hjorth & Madsen [92] and Chavanis *et al.* [83]. Numerical simulations of violent relaxation have been made by van Albada [93] who compared his results with the phenomenological de Vaucouleur $R^{1/4}$ law. In the collisional regime, the evolution is first governed by the evaporation of high energy stars. Numerical simulations [86] show that the system reaches a quasi stationary state close to the Michie-King distribution that slowly evolves in amplitude due to the evaporation as the system loses mass and energy. The density follows the isothermal law r^{-2} in the central region (with a core of almost uniform density) and decreases like $r^{-7/2}$ in the halo (that has anisotropic velocity distribution). At some point of the evolution, when the density contrast between the core and the halo becomes sufficiently high, the system undergoes a thermodynamical instability related to the Antonov [25] instability, and the gravothermal catastrophe [26] takes place. Core collapse has been studied numerically by Cohn [24] using the orbit-averaged-Fokker-Planck equation. He finds that the collapse is self-similar, that the central density becomes infinite in a finite time, and that the density behaves like $r^{-2.23}$. When the system is confined in a box, instead of being free to expand, Taruya & Sakagami [94] observe numerically that the evolution follows a sequence of q -distributions (polytropes) with a time dependent index $q(t)$ until an instability develops (that we interpret as a Vlasov dynamical instability in [72]). We think that a good understanding of stellar dynamics has been reached by astrophysicists for a long time.

Point vortices: the scenario proposed by Chavanis [39, 45], by analogy with stellar dynamics, has been tested numerically by Kawahara & Nakanishi [95, 96] in two very interesting papers. We would like to complete their discussion in the light of the kinetic theory presented in this paper. The kinetic theory developed in [39, 45, 40] is valid at the order $O(1/N)$ and, consequently, the natural timescale is Nt_D . This is precisely the relaxation time that Kawahara & Nakanishi observe [96]. This seems consistent at first sight with the kinetic theory. However, if we consider things carefully, the situation appears to be more complicated. Indeed, we have seen in Sec. 3.1 that the collision term can vanish leading to a relaxation time larger than Nt_D . However, we have indicated that this cancelation occurs only for axisymmetric systems with monotonic profile of angular velocity. Now, in the simulations of Kawahara & Nakanishi [96] the system is non-axisymmetric. Indeed, in most cases, the phase of violent relaxation leads to a vortex crystal (see their Figs 2.b and 7). Therefore, we cannot use the axisymmetric kinetic equation (68) and we must come back to the more general kinetic equation (52). Little is known concerning this complicated equation but we expect that it increases the entropy and conserves energy and circulation [40]. It is not clear whether this equation rigorously converges towards the Boltzmann distribution but, since the entropy increases, we deduce that the system has the *tendency* to approach the Boltzmann distribution (it becomes more mixed). This is because there are additional resonances with respect to a purely axisymmetric evolution. Since the proper timescale of this kinetic equation is Nt_D , the kinetic theory of *non-axisymmetric flows* may explain the numerical observations of Kawahara & Nakanishi [96]. There remains, however, a difficulty. Indeed, in their Fig. 2a, violent relaxation leads to an apparently axisymmetric distribution with a presumably monotonically decreasing profile of angular velocity. In that case, there should be no resonance and the relaxation time should be larger than Nt_D contrary to what is observed numerically. We speculate that, in this case, the system is not really axisymmetric but that there exists “structures” in the flow (analogous to Dawson’s vortices in neutral plasmas under a strong magnetic field [97]). This claim is corroborated by the fact that Kawahara & Nakanishi [96] observe anomalous diffusion which means that the evolution of the flow is more complex than it seems. These results have been confirmed recently by Yoshida [98] who showed that the mean square displacements exhibit a universal time dependence $\langle [r(t) - r(0)]^2 \rangle \sim t^\mu$ with $\mu = 1.75 \pm 0.1$. These authors attribute anomalous diffusion to occasional long jumps of the particles convected by long living large vortices. If there exists such “structures”, they may induce new resonances and explain the relaxation towards Boltzmann equilibrium on a timescale Nt_D . This may also imply that there is no contradiction with the kinetic theory concerning the diffusion process. The diffusion coefficient (79) and the Fokker-Planck equation (82) derived in [39, 45] are only valid for axisymmetric flows without “structures”. In more general cases, the diffusion equation is given by Eq. (142) of [40] which involves delocalization in space and time. It is plausible that these non ideal effects lead to anomalous diffusion for short times. Normal diffusion should be recovered for larger times (anomalous diffusion could also be a finite size effect

and it could disappear for large N). As indicated by Kawahara & Nakanishi [96], this is precisely what happens for neutral plasmas under a strong magnetic field in relation to the Taylor-McNamara [99] diffusion. Of course, this scenario demands to be confirmed but it seems plausible enough to reconcile theory and observations. More work remains to be done in order to better understand these results. In this respect, we may note the recent study of Sano [100] on the kinetic theory of point vortices. He confirmed the results of Chavanis [39, 40] (leading to Landau-type kinetic equations) and derived a kinetic equation corresponding to the Lenard-Balescu equation for plasmas using the theory of the Fredholm integral equation. We may also note that the exponential tail of the velocity distribution observed by Kawahara & Nakanishi [96] is consistent with the results reported by Chavanis & Sire [101] when the vortices have a finite core, which is equivalent to putting a restriction on the point vortex distance in the initial state. Therefore, this observation (exponential tail) is not inconsistent with kinetic theory.

HMF model: the scenario proposed by Yamaguchi *et al.* [57] has been checked numerically by these authors and by Campa *et al.* [58, 72]. The relaxation time has been discussed by Bouchet & Dauxois [52] and Chavanis [31] in the light of the kinetic theory. These authors argue that, for spatially homogeneous systems, the relaxation time is larger than Nt_D since there is no resonance. Bouchet & Dauxois [52] claim that this result is consistent with the timescale $N^{1.7}$ numerically observed by Yamaguchi *et al.* [57]. Chavanis [31] claims that this is consistent with the timescale e^N observed by Campa *et al.* [58]. We would like to reconsider and complete their discussions. In the simulation of Yamaguchi *et al.* [57], that is performed for subcritical energies $U < U_c$, the system does *not* remain spatially homogeneous so that the homogeneous kinetic theory cannot be advocated until the end. Alternatively, Campa *et al.* [58] perform supercritical simulations $U > U_c$, in which the system remains permanently spatially homogeneous, and find that the relaxation time scales like e^N . Therefore, when the system is homogeneous the relaxation time is exponentially long! This is in agreement with the kinetic theory but this shows that the relaxation is not due to just three-body, four-body, n -body... correlations (as we could naively believe), that would imply a relaxation time scaling as N^2 , N^3 , N^{n-1} ... All the correlations functions seem to matter! Therefore, the kinetic theory of spatially homogeneous systems cannot apparently be truncated at some power of $1/N$. Using the analogy between the point vortex model and the HMF model, we may conjecture that the relaxation time for an axisymmetric distribution of point vortices with monotonic profile of angular velocity scales like e^N (although the possibility that such distributions never achieve statistical equilibrium cannot be rejected). When the system is spatially inhomogeneous, the relaxation time is reduced with respect to e^N . This leads to a reinterpretation of the numerical results. Yamaguchi *et al.* [57] performed two types of simulations: (i) the first one, corresponding to unstable stationary Vlasov states, leads to a spatially inhomogeneous evolution. In that case, the collisional relaxation times scales like N which is the proper scaling of the kinetic theory for spatially inhomogeneous systems. Indeed, there exists many resonances that “push” the system towards the Boltzmann distribution (see Sec. 4). The

question whether the system really reaches the Boltzmann distribution, or a distribution *close* to it, remains open. (ii) The second, which starts from Vlasov stable stationary states, leads to spatially homogeneous structures. In that case, there is no resonance and we should expect a relaxation time scaling as e^N . However, Campa *et al.* [72] argue that the relaxation towards Boltzmann equilibrium involves a dynamical phase transition that is triggered when the homogeneous phase becomes Vlasov unstable. In that case, the system becomes spatially inhomogeneous and resonances appear. This considerably accelerates the relaxation with respect to the exponential scaling and leads to a non trivial (but probably non universal) scaling $N^{1.7}$. Therefore, in that case, the timescale cannot be solely understood in terms of the kinetic theory of homogeneous systems, although this theory explains why the scaling is larger than N . Morita & Kaneko [102], considering an initial condition with $U < U_c$ and $M_0 = 1$, found a relaxation time $t_R \sim Nt_D$. In their simulations, the system is always spatially inhomogeneous (the magnetization has an oscillatory behavior) and the relaxation time is consistent with the natural scaling of the kinetic theory for inhomogeneous distributions. Their results may be consistent with the general kinetic equations (2) and (101) although this is of course difficult to check. Let us finally consider the early simulation of Latora *et al.* [103] which starts from an out-of-equilibrium initial state with magnetization $M_0 = 1$. Violent relaxation leads the system to a spatially homogeneous QSS which is followed by a collisional relaxation towards the Boltzmann distribution. They find a relaxation time scaling like Nt_D . This timescale seems to be inconsistent with the kinetic theory of spatially homogeneous systems. However, as in the case of 2D point vortices, we speculate that there exists “phase-space structures” that make the system spatially inhomogeneous and induce additional resonances. These inhomogeneities may reduce the timescale of relaxation to the natural timescale Nt_D . These “phase-space structures” are indeed present in the simulations of Latora *et al.* [103] and they seem to be responsible for anomalous diffusion in a way similar to what happens in 2D point vortex dynamics [96, 98]. Again, this scenario demands to be confirmed but it seems plausible enough to reconcile theory and observations. We must, however, be very careful because these striking features (phase-space structures and anomalous diffusion) may be due to finite size effects [104, 105] and disappear for $N \rightarrow +\infty$. Also, diffusion may be anomalous for short times and normal for large times. This may be a way to reconcile the approaches of Rapisarda & Pluchino [106] and Bouchet & Dauxois [52] who studied temporal correlation functions and anomalous diffusion. Indeed, their studies are based on very different arguments: Bouchet & Dauxois [52] assume that the background distribution is spatially homogeneous and use standard kinetic theory based on Fokker-Planck equations. Alternatively, Rapisarda & Pluchino [106] assume that anomalous diffusion is due to the presence of phase-space structures and use nonlinear Fokker-Planck equations. We believe that these two approaches are not antagonistic but that they apply to different regimes or, maybe, different numbers of particles.

In conclusion, we have developed a kinetic theory of systems with long-range interactions based on the generalized (and not well-known) kinetic equations (2), (52)

and (88). A specificity of our approach is to remain in physical space and take into account spatial inhomogeneity which is the norm for systems with long-range interactions. This is the main difference with kinetic theories of systems with short-range interactions and neutral plasmas that are spatially homogeneous. Interestingly, the homogeneous kinetic equation can be easily derived from the generalized kinetic equation with simple calculations. This provides a new derivation of Landau-type equations and also offers a unified description of the kinetic theory of stellar systems, 2D point vortices and the HMF model. As an application, we have argued that the relaxation time of spatially inhomogeneous 1D systems (or non axisymmetric 2D flows) should scale as Nt_D which is the natural timescale of the kinetic theory. Indeed, spatially inhomogeneous systems involve many resonances that allow the relaxation (or the approach) of the system towards Boltzmann equilibrium. By contrast, for one dimensional homogeneous systems (or axisymmetric flows with monotonic profile of angular velocity), the resonances disappear and the relaxation timescale is considerably increased. We have speculated that, when the system remains permanently homogeneous, the natural timescale is $e^N t_D$. In the HMF model, this corresponds to supercritical energies considered by Campa *et al.* [58]. If the QSS resulting from violent relaxation is homogeneous but, later evolving under the development of correlations, undergoes at some point a dynamical phase transition (Vlasov instability) from the homogeneous phase to the inhomogeneous phase, the relaxation time should be intermediate between Nt_D and $e^N t_D$. For example, it can scale algebraically as $N^\delta t_D$. This corresponds to subcritical energies considered by Yamaguchi *et al.* [57]. They find $\delta = 1.7$ but this scaling may not be universal. We have motivated our arguments by a detailed comparison with existing numerical simulations and found interesting agreements. This shows that kinetic theory can be a good approach to understand the dynamics and thermodynamics of systems with long-range interactions but that many works remain to be done to obtain a complete description of spatially inhomogeneous systems.

Appendix A. Calculation of $K^{\mu\nu}$

In $d = 3$, we introduce a spherical system of coordinates where the z axis is taken in the direction of $\mathbf{w}$. Then

$$K^{\mu\nu} = \pi(2\pi)^3 m^2 \int_0^{+\infty} k^2 dk \int_0^\pi \sin \theta d\theta \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi k^\mu k^\nu \delta(kw \cos \theta) \hat{u}(k)^2. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Using $k_x = k \sin \theta \cos \phi$, $k_y = k \sin \theta \sin \phi$ and $k_z = k \cos \theta$, it is easy to see that only K^{xx} , K^{yy} and K^{zz} can be non-zero. The other components of the matrix $K^{\mu\nu}$ vanish by symmetry. Furthermore

$$K^{xx} = K^{yy} = \pi^2(2\pi)^3 m^2 \int_0^{+\infty} k^2 dk \int_0^\pi \sin \theta d\theta k^2 \delta(kw \cos \theta) \hat{u}(k)^2 \sin^2 \theta. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Using the identity $\delta(\lambda x) = \frac{1}{|\lambda|}\delta(x)$, we get

$$K^{xx} = K^{yy} = \pi^2(2\pi)^3 m^2 \frac{1}{w} \int_0^{+\infty} k^3 \hat{u}(k)^2 dk \int_0^\pi \sin^3 \theta \delta(\cos \theta) d\theta. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

With the change of variables $t = \cos \theta$, we obtain

$$K^{xx} = K^{yy} = \pi^2(2\pi)^3 m^2 \frac{1}{w} \int_0^{+\infty} k^3 \hat{u}(k)^2 dk \int_{-1}^{+1} (1 - t^2) \delta(t) dt, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

so that finally

$$K^{xx} = K^{yy} = 8\pi^5 m^2 \frac{1}{w} \int_0^{+\infty} k^3 \hat{u}(k)^2 dk. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

On the other hand

$$K^{zz} = 2\pi^2(2\pi)^3 m^2 \frac{1}{w} \int_0^{+\infty} k^3 \hat{u}(k)^2 dk \int_0^\pi \sin \theta \cos^2 \theta \delta(\cos \theta) d\theta = 0. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

In conclusion, we obtain

$$K^{\mu\nu} = \frac{K}{w} \left(\delta^{\mu\nu} - \frac{w^\mu w^\nu}{w^2} \right), \quad (\text{A.7})$$

with

$$K = 8\pi^5 m^2 \int_0^{+\infty} k^3 \hat{u}(k)^2 dk. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

In $d = 2$, we introduce a polar system of coordinates where the x axis is taken in the direction of $\mathbf{w}$. Then

$$K^{\mu\nu} = \pi(2\pi)^2 m^2 \int_0^{+\infty} k dk \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta k^\mu k^\nu \delta(kw \cos \theta) \hat{u}(k)^2. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Using $k_x = k \cos \theta$, $k_y = k \sin \theta$, it is easy to see that only K^{xx} and K^{yy} can be non-zero. The other components of the matrix $K^{\mu\nu}$ vanish by symmetry. Furthermore

$$K^{yy} = \pi(2\pi)^2 m^2 \int_0^{+\infty} k dk \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta k^2 \delta(kw \cos \theta) \hat{u}(k)^2 \sin^2 \theta, \quad (\text{A.10})$$

or, equivalently,

$$K^{yy} = 2\pi(2\pi)^2 m^2 \frac{1}{w} \int_0^{+\infty} k^2 dk \hat{u}(k)^2 \int_0^\pi d\theta \delta(\cos \theta) \sin^2 \theta. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

With the change of variables $t = \cos \theta$, we obtain

$$K^{yy} = 2\pi(2\pi)^2 m^2 \frac{1}{w} \int_0^{+\infty} k^2 \hat{u}(k)^2 dk \int_{-1}^{+1} \sqrt{1 - t^2} \delta(t) dt, \quad (\text{A.12})$$

so that finally

$$K^{yy} = 8\pi^3 m^2 \frac{1}{w} \int_0^{+\infty} k^2 \hat{u}(k)^2 dk. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

On the other hand

$$K^{xx} = \pi(2\pi)^2 m^2 \frac{1}{w} \int_0^{+\infty} k^2 dk \hat{u}(k)^2 \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta \delta(\cos \theta) \cos^2 \theta = 0. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

In conclusion, we obtain

$$K^{\mu\nu} = \frac{K}{w} \left(\delta^{\mu\nu} - \frac{w^\mu w^\nu}{w^2} \right), \quad (\text{A.15})$$

with

$$K = 8\pi^3 m^2 \int_0^{+\infty} k^2 \hat{u}(k)^2 dk. \quad (\text{A.16})$$

Appendix B. Calculation of $\chi(r, r_1)$

For the ordinary potential $u(|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_1|) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \ln |\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_1|$, we have

$$u(r, r_1, \phi) = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \ln(r^2 + r_1^2 - 2rr_1 \cos \phi), \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where $\phi = \theta - \theta_1$. Its Fourier transform on the angles can be written

$$\hat{u}_m(r, r_1) = -\frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int_0^\pi \ln(1 - \lambda \cos \phi) \cos(m\phi) d\phi - \frac{\delta_{m0}}{4\pi} \ln(r^2 + r_1^2), \quad (\text{B.2})$$

with $\lambda = \frac{2rr_1}{r^2 + r_1^2}$. For $m \neq 0$, we have the identity

$$\int_0^\pi \ln(1 - \lambda \cos \phi) \cos(m\phi) d\phi = -\frac{\pi}{|m|} \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{\lambda^2} - 1} \right)^{|m|}. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Therefore

$$\hat{u}_m(r, r_1) = \frac{1}{4\pi|m|} \left(\frac{r^2 + r_1^2 - |r^2 - r_1^2|}{2rr_1} \right)^{|m|} = \frac{1}{4\pi|m|} \left(\frac{r_{<}}{r_{>}} \right)^{|m|}, \quad (\text{B.4})$$

where $r_{<}$ (resp. $r_{>}$) is the min (resp. max) of r and r_1 . For $m = 0$, we have the identity

$$\int_0^\pi \ln(1 - \lambda \cos \phi) d\phi = \pi \ln(1 + \sqrt{1 - \lambda^2}) - \pi \ln 2. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Therefore

$$\hat{u}_0(r, r_1) = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \ln \left(\frac{r^2 + r_1^2 + |r^2 - r_1^2|}{2} \right) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \ln r_{>}. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Combining the previous results, the potential of interaction can be written

$$u(r, r_1, \phi) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \ln r_{>} + \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{m \neq 0} \frac{1}{|m|} \left(\frac{r_{<}}{r_{>}} \right)^{|m|} e^{im\phi}. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

The function defined by Eq. (69) takes the form

$$\chi(r, r_1) = \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \sum_{m=1}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{m} \left(\frac{r_{<}}{r_{>}} \right)^{2m} = -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln \left[1 - \left(\frac{r_{<}}{r_{>}} \right)^2 \right]. \quad (\text{B.8})$$

In particular

$$\chi(r, r) = \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \sum_{m=1}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{m} = \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln \Lambda, \quad (\text{B.9})$$

where $\ln \Lambda$ is a Coulombian logarithm that has to be regularized appropriately (see, e.g. [41]).

References

- [1] L. Boltzmann, Wien, Ber. **66**, 275 (1872)
- [2] L.D. Landau, Phys. Z. Sowj. Union **10**, 154 (1936)
- [3] A. Lenard, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **10**, 390 (1960)
- [4] R. Balescu, Phys. Fluids **3**, 52 (1960)
- [5] J. Hubbard, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. **260**, 114 (1961)

- [6] S. Chandrasekhar, *Principles of Stellar Dynamics* (University of Chicago press, 1942)
- [7] S. Chandrasekhar, *Astrophys. J.* **97**, 255 (1943)
- [8] S. Chandrasekhar, *Astrophys. J.* **97**, 263 (1943)
- [9] M. Rosenbluth, W. MacDonald, D. Judd, *Phys. Rev.* **107**, 1 (1957)
- [10] S. Chandrasekhar, J. von Neumann, *Astrophys. J.* **95**, 489 (1942)
- [11] R.S. Cohen, L. Spitzer, P.M. Routly, *Phys. Rev.* **80**, 230 (1950)
- [12] S. Chandrasekhar, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **21**, 383 (1949)
- [13] L. Spitzer, R. Härm, *Astrophys. J.* **127**, 544 (1958)
- [14] R. Michie, *Mon. not. R. astron. Soc.* **125**, 127 (1963)
- [15] I.R. King, *Astron. J.* **70**, 376 (1965)
- [16] M. Lemou, P.H. Chavanis, *Physica A* **389**, 1021 (2010)
- [17] I. King, *Astron. J.* **65**, 122 (1960)
- [18] P.H. Chavanis, *Eur. Phys. J. B* **52**, 61 (2006)
- [19] H. Kandrup, *Astrophys. J.* **244**, 316 (1981)
- [20] J.H. Jeans, *Mon. not. R. astron. Soc.* **76**, 71 (1915)
- [21] A.A. Vlasov, *Zh. Eksp. i Teor. Fiz.* **8**, 291 (1938)
- [22] M. Hénon, *Astron. Astrophys.* **114**, 211 (1982)
- [23] M. Hénon, *Ann. Astrophys.* **5**, 369 (1961)
- [24] H. Cohn, *Astrophys. J.* **242**, 765 (1980)
- [25] V.A. Antonov, *Vest. Leningr. Gos. Univ.* **7**, 135 (1962).
- [26] D. Lynden-Bell, R. Wood, *Mon. not. R. astron. Soc.* **138**, 495 (1968)
- [27] S. Chandrasekhar, *Astrophys. J.* **99**, 47 (1944)
- [28] E.P. Lee, *ApJ* **151**, 687 (1968)
- [29] I.H. Gilbert, *Astrophys. J.* **152**, 1043 (1968)
- [30] G. Severne, M.J. Haggerty, *Astro. Space Sci.* **45**, 287 (1976)
- [31] P.H. Chavanis, *Physica A* **387**, 787 (2008)
- [32] P.H. Chavanis, *Physica A* **387**, 1504 (2008)
- [33] D. Montgomery, G. Joyce, *Phys. Fluids* **17**, 1139 (1974)
- [34] G. Kirchhoff, in *Lectures in Mathematical Physics, Mechanics* (Teubner, Leipzig, 1877).
- [35] L. Onsager, *Nuovo Cimento, Suppl.* **6**, 279 (1949)
- [36] T.S. Lundgren, Y.B. Pointin, *J. Stat. Phys.* **17**, 323 (1977)
- [37] G.L. Eyink, K.R. Sreenivasan, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **78**, 87 (2006)
- [38] D. Dubin, T.M. O'Neil, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60**, 1286 (1988)
- [39] P.H. Chavanis, *Phys. Rev. E* **64**, 026309 (2001)
- [40] P.H. Chavanis, *Physica A* **387**, 1123 (2008)
- [41] P.H. Chavanis, M. Lemou, *Eur. Phys. J. B* **59**, 217 (2007)
- [42] K.M. Khanin, *Physica D* **2**, 261 (1982)
- [43] P.H. Chavanis, *Phys. Rev. E* **58**, R1199 (1998)
- [44] P.H. Chavanis, C. Sire, *Phys. Rev. E* **62**, 490 (2000)
- [45] P.H. Chavanis, *Statistical mechanics of two-dimensional vortices and stellar systems*, in: *Dynamics and thermodynamics of systems with long range interactions*, edited by Dauxois, T, Ruffo, S., Arimondo, E. and Wilkens, M. *Lecture Notes in Physics*, Springer (2002)
- [46] Nazarenko, S., Zakharov, V.E.: *Physica D* **56**, 381 (1992)
- [47] Marmanis, H.: *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* **454**, 587 (1998)
- [48] Sire, C., Chavanis, P.H.: *Phys. Rev. E* **61**, 6644 (2000)
- [49] Newton, P.K., Mezic, I.: *Journal of Turbulence* **3**, 52 (2002)
- [50] A. Campa, T. Dauxois, S. Ruffo, *Phys. Rep.* **480**, 57 (2009)
- [51] F. Bouchet, *Phys. Rev. E* **70**, 036113 (2004)
- [52] F. Bouchet, T. Dauxois, *Phys. Rev. E* **72**, 5103 (2005)
- [53] P.H. Chavanis, J. Vatteville, F. Bouchet, *Eur. Phys. J. B* **46**, 61 (2005)

- [54] S. Inagaki, Prog. Theor. Phys. **96**, 1307 (1996)
- [55] O.C. Eldridge, M. Feix, Phys. Fluids. **6**, 398 (1962)
- [56] B.B. Kadomtsev, O.P. Pogutse, Phys. Rev. Lett. **25**, 1155 (1970)
- [57] Y. Yamaguchi, J. Barré, F. Bouchet, T. Dauxois, S. Ruffo, Physica A **337**, 36 (2004)
- [58] A. Campa, A. Giansanti, G. Morelli, Phys. Rev. E **76**, 041117 (2007)
- [59] S. Marksteiner, K. Ellinger and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. A **53**, 34 (1996)
- [60] Y.Y. Yamaguchi, F. Bouchet, T. Dauxois, J. Stat. Mech.: Theor. Exp. **1**, 20 (2007)
- [61] P.H. Chavanis, M. Lemou, Phys. Rev. E **72**, 061106 (2005)
- [62] I.F. Potapenko, A.V. Bobylev, C.A. de Azevedo, A.S. de Assis, Phys. Rev. E **56**, 7159 (1997)
- [63] P.H. Chavanis, Eur. Phys. J. B **52**, 47 (2006)
- [64] P.H. Chavanis, Physica A **377**, 469 (2007)
- [65] P.H. Chavanis, AIP Conf. Proc. **970**, 39 (2008)
- [66] J. Messer, H. Spohn, J. Stat. Phys. **29**, 561 (1982)
- [67] M. Kiessling, J. Stat. Phys. **55**, 203 (1989)
- [68] W. Braun, K. Hepp, Commun. Math. Phys. **56**, 101 (1977)
- [69] M. Hauray, P.E. Jabin, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. **183**, 489 (2007)
- [70] E. Caglioti, F. Rousset, J. Stat. Phys. **129**, 241 (2007)
- [71] D. Lynden-Bell, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **136**, 101 (1967)
- [72] A. Campa, P.H. Chavanis, A. Giansanti, G. Morelli, Phys. Rev. E **78**, 040102 (2008)
- [73] P.H. Chavanis, Physica A **361**, 81 (2006)
- [74] C. Benedetti, S. Rambaldi, G. Turchetti, Physica A **364**, 197 (2006)
- [75] H. Kandrup, Astro. Space. Sci. **97**, 435 (1983)
- [76] E. Caglioti, P.L. Lions, C. Marchioro, M. Pulvirenti, Commun. Math. Phys. **143**, 501 (1992)
- [77] M. Kiessling, Commun. Pure Appl. Math. **47**, 27 (1993)
- [78] G.L. Eyink, H. Spohn, J. Stat. Phys. **70**, 833 (1993)
- [79] E. Caglioti, P.L. Lions, C. Marchioro, M. Pulvirenti, Commun. Math. Phys. **174**, 229 (1995)
- [80] M. Kiessling, J. Lebowitz, Lett. Math. Phys. **42**, 43 (1997)
- [81] J. Miller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 2137 (1990)
- [82] R. Robert, J. Sommeria, J. Fluid Mech. **229**, 291 (1991)
- [83] P.H. Chavanis, J. Sommeria, R. Robert, Astrophys. J. **471**, 385 (1996)
- [84] P. Valageas, Phys. Rev. E **74**, 016606 (2006)
- [85] M. Hénon, Ann. Astrophys. **27**, 83 (1964)
- [86] L. Spitzer, Dynamical Evolution of Globular Clusters (Princeton Series in Astrophysics, 1987)
- [87] J. Binney, S. Tremaine, Galactic Dynamics (Princeton Series in Astrophysics, 1987)
- [88] C. Tsallis, J. Stat. Phys. **52**, 479 (1988)
- [89] P.H. Chavanis, A. Campa [arXiv:1001.2109]
- [90] P.H. Chavanis, Physica A **365**, 102 (2006)
- [91] M. Stiavelli, G. Bertin, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **229**, 61 (1987)
- [92] J. Hjorth, J. Madsen, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **253**, 703 (1991)
- [93] T.S. van Albada, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **201**, 939 (1982)
- [94] A. Taruya, M. Sakagami, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 181101 (2003)
- [95] R. Kawahara, H. Nakanishi, J. Phys. Soc. Japan **76**, 074001 (2007)
- [96] R. Kawahara, H. Nakanishi, J. Phys. Soc. Japan **75**, 054001 (2006)
- [97] J.M. Dawson, H. Okuda, R.N. Carlile, Phys. Rev. Lett. **27**, 491 (1971)
- [98] T. Yoshida, J. Phys. Soc. Japan **78**, 024004 (2009)
- [99] J.B. Taylor, B. McNamara, Phys. Fluids **14**, 1492 (1971)
- [100] M.M. Sano, Phys. Rev. E **76**, 046312 (2007)

- [101] P.H. Chavanis, C. Sire, *Phys. Fluids* **13**, 1904 (2001)
- [102] H. Morita, K. Kaneko, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 050602 (2006)
- [103] V. Latora, A. Rapisarda, C. Tsallis, *Phys. Rev. E* **64**, 056134 (2001)
- [104] L. Moyano, C. Anteneodo, *Phys. Rev. E* **74**, 021118 (2006)
- [105] A. Antoniazzi, D. Fanelli, J. Barré, P.H. Chavanis, T. Dauxois, S. Ruffo, *Phys. Rev. E* **75**, 011112 (2007)
- [106] A. Rapisarda, A. Pluchino, *Europhys. News* **36**, 202 (2005)